LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE

THE NEW REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXIX NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 9, 1939 NUMBER 1288

Take a Poll, Miss Jones

The National Association of Manufacturers has taken a poll. As a result of "a nationwide survey" it has found that public sentiment is increasingly against "the arbitrary forcing of workers to join unions." It was a tidy little survey: only two questions were propounded. The first was, "Should every worker be forced to join a union?" And the second was, "Who has done the most for the United States in the last ten years?" The voters were offered a choice among "Manufacturers, Industrialists, Merchants, Bankers, Labor Leaders, Political Men, Social Reformers and Don't Know." Don't Know won the second contest handily, with Manufacturers second, and the others finishing in the order given. The first question brought an overwhelmingly negative response. Sixty-one percent of The People are against forcing every worker to join a union.

If the fashion is conducting polls, à la Dr. Gallup, The New Republic would hate to be regarded as old hat. So using the sampling technique (without moving a muscle) we have conducted a nationwide survey on the question, "Are you in favor of allowing the dirty Communists to continue forcing Americans to permit half the stripes in Old Glory to be red?" The public response to the survey was gratifying, showing as it does a marked upward trend:

Reply	1937 *percent*	1939 *percent*
No	79.2	84.6
Yes	3.2	1.7
Don't Know	5.4	7.6
What time is it?	12.2	6.1

A Quarter Century of Folly

If there was ever an anniversary the world would like to pass over in shamefaced silence, it is the quarter-century mark since the beginning of the "Great War" (what was great about it, we have never understood). Today Europe and the world are again on the brink of catastrophe. Armaments are bigger than they were in 1914 and it is calculated that more men are in uniform. People sometimes marvel that despite the lesson of a war which nearly destroyed civilization, mankind should be preparing another one, but this is not so strange. The peace which followed was almost as reactionary and destructive as the war itself had been. Once again we see that the only lesson to be learned from history is that mankind learns nothing from history.

The War of Nerves Goes On

Week after week dragged by, and there still, on the twenty-fifth anniversary of the last World War, was no agreement between Great Britain and Russia. Mr. Chamberlain insisted he was trying hard to obtain such an agreement and offered as proof of his sincerity the fact that military conversations had been initiated among England, France and the USSR. Despite this, the European capitals were still filled with rumors that a new appeasement was in the air. These reports vied with others that Hitler was about to seize Danzig by force, or to strike in some other direction. "Insiders" set the date when fighting may be expected as August 15 or "the third week in August" or September 1 or December 1. Thus the war of nerves goes on. The

CONTENTS

The Week 1
Editorials
Making a Face at Japan 4
Doctors Disagree 5
The Government as Banker 6
General Articles
How to Amend the Wagner Act . . . . . Leonard Boudin 8
Mexico's 1940 . . . . . Ralph Bates 10
Song and Dance Unions . Maurice Zolotow 12
The Jewish National Army . Allan A. Michie 14
Seven Poets of a Crisis Year . . . . . Edited by Selden Rodman 16
Washington Notes . . . . . T. R. B. 18
Other People's Money . . John T. Flynn 19
No Visible Means of Support . Otis Ferguson 20
The Bandwagon 21
Correspondence 21
Books in Review
Death of a Prophet . . . Karl Menninger 23
Faith Plus Works . . . John Chamberlain 25
Argentinidad . . . . . B. P. Adams 26
More About the Brontës . . Otis Ferguson 27
New Books: A Reader's List 28

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1939, IN THE U.S.A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., 40 EAST 49TH ST., NEW YORK, N. Y.
ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world has already endured it longer than anyone would have predicted in advance that it possibly could.

Congress Kicks Up its Heels

The Tories in both Houses of Congress are acting like bronchos with burrs under their saddles. By August 1, both Houses separately had cut into ribbons the new measure to finance self-liquidating projects. Less than half of the proposal remained and it was not certain that it would survive even in this crippled form. The action of Congress had nothing to do with the merits of the proposals, or the country's urgent need of a stimulus to business. As in the case of the WPA bill a few weeks earlier, the members seemed to care nothing for what happens to the country as long as they can help protect their friends in big business and big banking and go home quickly. We believe however that the Tories may have overreached themselves. It has happened before that members of the national legislature have gone home from Washington to find their constituents injured by what they had done. If we are right, the tune may be very different in the next session.

Defending Garner

The same people who have listened calmly to scurrilous attacks on President Roosevelt—even on the floor of Congress—are now rising to protest the words of John L. Lewis about Mr. Garner. Mr. Lewis was angry because of the amendments to the federal wages-and-hours act that have been proposed by Representative Barden and, more generally, because of the many attacks on labor legislation by the present Congress. He singled out Mr. Garner personally because, he said, the campaign against labor emanated from the Vice President, whom Lewis called a "labor-baiting, whiskey-drinking, poker-playing, evil old man . . . searching for the quivering heart of labor."

Mr. Garner's friends are howling over these strong words, and that is only natural. But they really are much pleased by them. Under cover of resenting a "personal attack" they are using the occasion to strengthen the anti-labor legislative campaign of which Mr. Garner is the political center. Mr. Garner's friends in the Senate promptly passed another anti-labor bill—a bill to limit labor's use of its influence and money in political campaigns. Thus they help to prove Lewis's major charge.

Relief Law Begins to Crack

When Congress passed the new WPA bill we predicted that its members might have cause to regret their action, once they had heard from the country. Evidence that we were right is found in the fact that already the Senate has taken action to modify one of the worst features of the bill, that providing automatic dismissal for every member of the WPA who has been on the rolls eighteen months. Already Colonel Harrington has suspended such dismissals, pending action by the House.

A Bad Bill About Aliens

Once again, the House of Representatives has passed a thoroughly dangerous measure directed against aliens. As usual with such measures, it is so loosely drawn that it would make possible many types of tyrannical action. Membership in any group advocating violent overthrow of the government, no matter how long ago or for how brief a time, would be automatic cause for deportation. A man might enter such a group by accident, resign at once when he found its true purpose, spend fifty years fighting it and still be deported. Illegal ownership of firearms would be another reason for deportation. Books or periodicals would not be permitted to print or publish matter advocating violent overthrow of the government, or defending or justifying any such action. Another section intended to prevent the creation of disaffection in the Army and Navy is so broad that practically anything would come under its provisions. As The New York Times well says, if this proposal repeats existing measures it is superfluous; if it goes beyond them, it should be scrutinized with the greatest care and not rushed through in a slapdash fashion at the behest of a little band of witch-hunters. Repeatedly in the past the Senate has shown better sense than the House of Representatives in dealing with such proposals, and we hope this precedent may again be followed.

The Auto Workers' Strike

Violence has entered the four-weeks-old strike of automobile workers, and will perhaps help to draw public attention to an important labor contest. The General Motors Company, chief object of the strike, has insisted it cannot choose between the CIO-UAW and Homer Martin and his AFL-UAW. But General Motors' plaints are not quite convincing. If it feels so deeply concerned over the welfare of its employees, let it go ahead and settle with the CIO. Then, in the remote eventuality that the Martin group is designated by the NLRB as the appropriate bargaining agency, there will still be plenty of time to set things right.

Harlan Comes to Terms

When the Harlan County Coal Operators' Association signed a contract with the UMWA a few days ago it met the original union demands, as did all the other Appalachian operators. The union asked either a union-shop clause in the contract, or else exclusive bargaining rights for the UMWA and the abolition of the strike-penalty clause. The Harlan operators chose the latter alternative, whereas the other operators had preferred the former. But in either case the union is insured against encroachment by any other.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The notable characteristic of the settlement was that it came after a six-weeks' strike in which the National Guard had been called in to open the mines and two union miners had been killed in fighting between the soldiers and pickets. The bullheadedness of the employers that caused this violence didn't win them a penny or a principle in the contract; they might have signed exactly the same document before. Perhaps they were just trying to show the world how tough they were. They will have an even better chance to do that, however, when some of them—and certain deputy sheriffs—come to trial for the second time October 2, on charges of having denied the miners rights guaranteed them under federal law. Everyone who has read the record on Harlan County compiled by the La Follette Committee will hope this trial does not end, like the last, in a hung jury.

Japan Trades with Germany

A smile in the news is worth millions nowadays, even if it is a grim one. We got such a smile out of the item the other day which said that under their new commercial treaty Japan will send food to Germany, which will send back munitions in exchange. Poor Japan, whose population according to reliable reports is on starvation rations, will export to her ally food she hasn't got in exchange for munitions which Germany cannot spare. For some reason we are reminded of the moth-eaten joke: "If I had some ham, I could have some ham and eggs—if I had some eggs."

"Made in Germany"

Anyone who doesn't know that much of the type used in American books and magazines comes from Germany—and earns royalties for the Nazis—has a chance now to check up. The Graphic Arts Forum, an organization of printers, typographers and advertising men, has issued a boycott list of Nazi type, giving names and showing examples, as well as alternative types that are of American manufacture. The proclamation of boycott has been sent to some thousands of advertising men, designers and "buyers of printing" listed in the Standard Advertising Register. It is signed by publishers (Bennett A. Cerf, Donald Brace, Alfred A. Knopf), artists (Lynd Ward, Rockwell Kent), designers (Fred W. Goudy) and others directly or indirectly concerned. Our readers can obtain copies of the proclamation by writing Howard Willard, Graphic Arts Forum, 310 East Fifty-fifth Street, New York City.

There have been some embarrassing moments for anti-fascists as a result. China Today now carries a line stating that its typography is American throughout. That's because it recently discovered—with horror—that it had been using some Nazi types. Other anti-fascist publications, our spies tell us, are even more embarrassed.

People Don't Trust the Press

Newspaper publishers have every reason to be disturbed over a poll printed in the current issue of Fortune. The magazine made a wide inquiry as to the extent to which the public trusts the press, with some results that must be painful reading for newspapermen. For example, two-thirds of those questioned believed that the newspaper would color the news to help a friendly politician or a friend of the publisher. Sixty percent thought this would be done for a big advertiser and 50 percent for business in general. Two-thirds of those consulted get their news from the press, yet of these, one-third believed that radio news broadcasts are more accurate and two-thirds, that they are more just. If they heard conflicting versions of the same story from various sources, 22 percent would accept that of a radio press bulletin, 17 percent a radio commentator, 13 percent an authority making a speech, 12 percent a newspaper editorial, 11 percent a newspaper item and only 3 percent a newspaper columnist. On detail, such an inquiry need not be taken too seriously; but its general drift is of great importance. There is no doubt at all that the American people as a whole do not trust the press.

The Bankers Dream a Statistic

All over the United States, banks have recently been increasing the charges they make to their commercial depositors. Sometimes this has come in the form of an increase in the minimum balance required, while in other cases a service fee is being asked for each check that is cleared. A persuasive pamphlet explaining why these new charges are necessary has been distributed by many banks—some 4,000 in fact—to their customers. It contains the statement:

> For example, a recent survey showed that more than two-thirds of the checking accounts in the banks of the country were being carried at a loss to the banks.

Among the depositors to receive this pamphlet was Silas Bent, a well known journalist and author, living in Old Greenwich, Connecticut. His curiosity aroused, Mr. Bent asked the manager of his bank who had made such a survey, and was told that it was the American Bankers' Association. But further inquiry showed that this was not true. Not only had the ABA made no such study, but experts on banking doubted that it would ever be possible to say whether or not the commercial checking accounts in a given bank were showing a profit. The pamphlet had been put out by a financial advertising agency in Chicago which readily admitted that no real survey had ever been made and that nobody could prove that the statement made was true. Yet banks go on demurely charging depositors for the use of their money.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

News Notes of a Week

Virginio Gayda, the Italian editor who is Mussolini's chief spokesman, went on his vacation, and some political insiders took this to mean there would be no war. They couldn't imagine even a little crisis without Gayda to write about it. . . . The French cabinet planned to continue the present Chamber of Deputies in office for two years more without an election. . . . The men who were formerly the Spanish Republican government, meeting in Paris, established a Mexican bank, with capital of about $60,000,000, to aid Spanish refugees who emigrated there. The plan was proposed by former Defense Minister Indalecio Prieto, and opposed by former Premier Juan Negrín. . . . Many Irishmen were leaving England in a hurry, after the passage of a bill giving the government power to treat those suspected of bombings as undesirable aliens. Nineteen expulsion orders were signed the first day the law was in force.

President Roosevelt hesitated over signing the Hatch bill, which would curtail political activities of government employees. He said he was puzzled by the vagueness of the wording in parts of the bill. He wasn't the only one. . . . The four largest manufacturers of typewriters in the United States—Remington, Underwood, Royal and L. C. Smith-Corona—were indicted for conspiracy to violate the federal anti-trust law by mutual price-fixing. . . . The International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees granted a charter to the American Federation of Actors, the latest move in a dispute discussed by Maurice Zolotow in this issue of The New Republic.

Making a Face at Japan

MR. ROOSEVELT'S ACTION in denouncing the 1911 commercial treaty with Japan seems to have been one of his characteristic impulsive actions. The British complain rather bitterly that they had been given no advance warning and said that if they had known what was coming, their own agreement with Japan made just a few days earlier would have been much different. But in fact, there is every reason to believe the British couldn't have been notified, since the action was taken on the spur of the moment after the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had refused to act promptly on a resolution of a similar aim.

What Mr. Roosevelt did was in reality an answer to the British exhibition of weakness in the new Anglo-Japanese agreement. He was trying to show Japan that while England might be forced into immobility by the dangerous situation in Europe, or by Mr. Chamberlain's continuing desire for appeasement, the United States is in no such position, but can and will enforce the rights and interests of her nationals in the Far East. Such an attitude comes a little oddly from the President who, early in the Sino-Japanese war, urged Americans to get out of the danger area and said this government could not be responsible for them; but consistency has always been one of Mr. Roosevelt's lesser virtues.

There is now no doubt at all—if there ever was any—that the denunciation of the treaty was a political move, not an economic one. Technically it will make no difference for six months, since that much notice is required. Actually it has already made an enormous difference. The Japanese had insisted, absurdly, in reading too much significance into the fact that the body of their former Ambassador, Mr. Saito, had been sent back to Japan on a United States battleship. They apparently sincerely believed that this meant the United States was on their side in the war. Now they know better, and the United States has been included with Great Britain as the chief object of those machine-made demonstrations of hostility in Tokyo which have so little real significance. Naturally, our stock has gone down even lower than before in Berlin and Rome. The dictators with a good deal of reason regard Mr. Roosevelt as the one leader of a great state who is most hostile to them. They perhaps ignore that he is also the one ruler who can afford the luxury of such hostility.

The first point to make about the President's action is that it should have come long ago. For two years we have been supplying Japan with an enormous proportion of the raw materials for her munitions—perhaps as much as 80 per cent or more. Until a few months ago, she also received airplanes in unlimited quantities. Mr. Roosevelt acted within the law but unwisely in failing to invoke the Neutrality Act at the very beginning of the Sino-Japanese war. It was not the intention of Congress in writing this law that the President should pick and choose among wars according to the terms of his own sympathies. Invoking the Neutrality Act, in our opinion, would have done Japan serious harm and China practically none. Even without invoking this Act, however, the President could have done far more than he has to hinder America's arming of Japan. The New Republic has repeatedly suggested that we should embargo all exports of scrap iron and steel, throughout the world. Such action would hurt Japan, Germany and Italy, but would do little harm to Great Britain and France. A mere Presidential request might stop sales of aviation gasoline, as he has already stopped the export of airplanes to countries guilty of civilian bombing. Finally, we might seek an international agreement to embargo exports of petroleum and its products to nations at war.

Does the President intend, at the end of six months, to seek an embargo on goods for Japan, under the Pittman proposal? If so, he is certain to find himself under heavy attack. True, a majority of public opinion is at present in favor of such a proposal, though no one knows what the attitude may be six months hence.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Those interested in trade with Japan, however, are certain to bring all possible pressure to bear. Importers of raw silk will point to the thousands of textile workers who will lose their employment if the silk trade is stopped. Exporters of cotton will argue quite correctly that to curtail their trade with Japan spells ruination to the South unless other buyers can be found. And where will they come from, in a world where we are already forced to subsidize our cotton exports to sell them at all?

More important than the economic question is the political one. Unless we are prepared to incur serious risk of war with Japan, and indeed with all the Axis powers, we should be wary of unilateral embargoes. It is possible to prevent Japan from using our materials with which to kill the Chinese without departing from legal neutrality, is is outlined above. An embargo directed against her alone would run the chance of infuriating her to seek reprisal.

The more one thinks about the President's action, the more serious it becomes. Without consulting anybody except Secretary Hull, the President has taken his most challenging step toward defiance of the Fascist bloc. In one day he has brought the United States far along the road toward war with Japan. Such responsibility ought not to rest in the hands of a single individual, no matter who he is or how worthy his motives. There is ample evidence, moreover, that the authors of the American Constitution never intended to permit such a concentration of power. Senator Nye a few days ago repeated a proposal made several times in the pages of The New Republic: that the President should consult continuously with a joint committee of the House and Senate on foreign affairs. The members of such a committee would be fully informed as to developments abroad and would be able to judge the wisdom of proposed action and, if necessary, to serve as a check upon an impulsive Chief Executive with a messianic complex. The President's action on the Japanese treaty confirms the wisdom of this proposal.

Doctors Disagree

THE DECISION of the District of Columbia court which throws out the government's indictment of the American Medical Association charging illegal interference with Group Health Association of Washington should not and will not end the case. Group Health is a coöperative association of government employees, seeking according to well established insurance principles to reduce the cost of medical care to its members. It was hampered in every conceivable way by organized medicine, which finally went to the extreme of excluding Group Health physicians from the hospitals.

This action falls under the legal ban against restraint of trade, provided doctors are subject to the anti-trust laws. The court said they are not, making much of the fact that medicine is a profession and not a trade. But the government had never contended that medicine is not a profession or is not entitled to formulate and administer its own professional standards. It is on record also, in the form of a letter from Assistant Attorney General Arnold reprinted in the journal of the American Hospitals Association, that the government does not question the right of hospitals to control the appointment of their own staffs according to professional standards. What the government does contend, however, is that the case in question has nothing to do with professional standards. The action indicted was rather a coercive secondary boycott, obstructing the rights of consumers, hospitals and doctors to experiment freely in their economic relationships. To say that because medicine is a profession, and a highly honored one whose standing is recognized in the law, doctors can with immunity violate the laws against restraint of trade, is like saying that a ministerial association could, because of the status of ministers in the pursuit of their profession, conspire to violate the law against burglary.

Organized medicine has a perfect right to disapprove of the system of practice employed by Group Health, to agitate against it and even to forbid its own membership from engaging in such practice. It is quite possible that this system is not the best way to solve the problem of medical care. The Department of Justice does not pretend to say; it makes no recommendations and takes no sides in the solution of that problem. It simply insists that the opportunity for social and economic experiment be not illegally barred. If organized medicine had objections to the quality of medical service offered by Group Health, it had the right to object on that ground. But no evidence is available to indicate that the doctors serving Group Health were disapproved for their professional qualifications or methods.

Some editorial writers advise the government to drop the suit for fear that it will have a bad effect on the willingness of doctors to coöperate in any solution of the problem, rather consolidating them, through group patriotism, behind the intransigency of Dr. Fishbein and the reactionaries in the Association. Medicine, it is said, is already showing signs of recognizing the need and doing something about it. Even in Washington, since the case was instituted, some Group Health doctors are allowed to practice in the hospitals. It is true that more and more intelligent doctors are paying serious attention to the problem of the cost of medical care. Nevertheless it is a question whether they would have been allowed as much scope as they have by their more conservative brethren if it had not been for public pressure. And it really is important for the government to establish the legal principle, not merely in reference to medicine, but in reference to other professional and occupational groups—for instance, the build-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing unions—that however immune from the trust laws they may be in pursuit of their legitimate occupations and interests, they cannot be allowed to strangle experiments of others who are attempting to bring about wider distribution of goods and services at lower prices.

The Government as Banker

THERE IS SEVERE CRITICISM of the administration's new plan for self-liquidating loans, on the ground that it is all a pretense, that the loans will not be self-liquidating at all. If such loans could safely be made with assurance of repayment, it is said, private lenders would make them. Government money, influenced by politics, just goes to bankrupt and improvident borrowers.

Here is a case where we have some facts to consult, since the government has for several years been in the lending business on a large scale. Bad loans have been made, to be sure, and losses have been incurred in such loans. But what is the record as a whole?

At the end of the fiscal year, June 30, 1939, the Treasury report on the government lending agencies showed that they had $7,648,238,983 loans outstanding. Their earned surplus and undivided profits stood at $247,336,298. No loss here—at least, not yet. Their excess of assets over liabilities was $4,121,500,580. They also held large reserves against loans, and $713,441,941 of property for sale.

Of these agencies, the RFC is of course the largest. It has made more than seven billions of loans, of which over five billions have been repaid. Though it has lost some money on its loans to business and industry—out of $170,000,000, there are in default $21,400,000, and delinquent $28,000,000—its operations as a whole show a surplus and undivided profit of $239,000,000. The RFC will certainly come out in the black if and when its operations are ended.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation has lent about $3,000,000,000, of which $600,000,000 has been repaid. The average loan still has eleven years to run. Accounts in good standing number 677,735; there have been repaid in full 52,000. Adjusted payments are being made on 126,102 more. HOLC has foreclosed on a good many homes; of these 50,605 have been resold, at a net loss of $38,835,000. It owns 88,801 more, many of which are being rented. Its total operations show a deficit of $58,400,000, but against this it has a reserve of $92,200,000, and it will probably recover all losses out of income, unless Congress reduces the interest rate, or unless business conditions become much worse than they have been.

The Farm Credit Administration owns 37 percent of the total farm-mortgage debt of the country; its mortgages have a capital value of $2,600,000,000. Most of these are long-term mortgages, extending up to forty years. All, however, are regularly amortized. The Federal Land Banks, a part of this organization, now have an earned surplus of $85,100,000 and reserves of $17,800,000. The Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, which makes loans on more liberal terms—on a basis of 75 percent of the value—has earned reserves of $38,000,000. FCA has foreclosed and sold farms, at an average loss of 25 percent, but the proportion is small enough in relation to the total so that this agency is profitable and is likely to remain so.

The Federal Housing Administration has guaranteed loans for home building aggregating $1,600,000,000 and has backed improvement loans for $850,000,000. It has so far lost $15,000,000 on improvement loans and $200,000 on houses, but it expects its insurance premiums to make up for such losses.

All these agencies have been operating in fields where the risks are considered poor. RFC loans were designed for embarrassed institutions; HOLC took over only mortgages that had been delinquent for two or more years; FCA was meant to help farmers who were in difficulties because of the worst depression in their history. The worst credit risk of all—Farm Security Administration—which has been helping submarginal farmers, tenants and sharecroppers, estimates that 70 to 80 percent of its loans will be repaid with interest. Of the $262,000,000 loaned to this lowest income group in America, $77,300,000—or nearly one-third—has already been repaid.

This is altogether a brilliant record, which does not justify the skepticism now being voiced about government loans, especially if these loans are made as investments rather than primarily for relief.

THE NEW REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

Editors
BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

Assistant Editors OTIS FERGUSON ELIZABETH HULING

Contributing Editors
JAMES BENÉT BRUCE BLIVEN JR. H. N. BRAILSFORD
HEYWOOD BROUN JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK
E. C. LINDEMAN JON. MITCHELL LEWIS MUMFORD
REXFORD G. TUGWELL

Treasurer: DANIEL MEBANE

E. G. WOOD, *Advertising Manager* BYRON DEXTER, *Circulation Manager*

SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

EDITED AND PRODUCED UNDER UNION CONDITIONS BY CONTRACT WITH THE BOOK AND MAGAZINE GUILD, LOCAL 18, UOPWA, CIO.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How to Amend the Wagner Act

THE WAGNER ACT must be amended to ensure its enforcement, not its emasculation. Passage of the House resolution to investigate the National Labor Relations Board marks only the latest maneuver to destroy it. For the foes of the act have been devotedly aggressive, while both labor and the Board in zealously guarding the act's great benefits have adopted a defensive position. Occupied with answering attacks upon the act, labor's partisans have failed to show that it must be strengthened if its benefits are to continue. In addition, the psychological disadvantage of being on the defensive has fostered the illusion created by Senator Burke and his colleagues that the act, which was expressly created to protect workers' rights, transgresses upon employers' rights. This has had a demoralizing effect upon the Board, which is now attempting to lean over backwards in behalf of employers and the AFL.

To America's largest corporations, the Wagner Act is not yet the law. Their attempts to amend it could be viewed as incongruous, since their behavior has been unaffected by it. Many have been inconvenienced by court orders, but their anti-labor policies are unchanged. These financial masters do not deal with unions, and fire men who join them. They manufacture company unions as a routine by-product. Though the Wagner Act has declared illegal employer-resistance to unionization and has thereby given labor tremendous growing power, the vast financial resources of such corporations as Republic Steel, Metropolitan Life, Ford, Douglas Aircraft and Consolidated Edison have placed them beyond the law.

Consolidated Edison, the world's largest operating utility, existed contentedly without labor unions until 1934, when the NRA's appearance induced it to create the Employees' Representation Plan, a company union. It easily manipulated that organization until April, 1937, when two frightening events occurred: first, thousands of its employees joined the CIO, and second, the Supreme Court held the Wagner Act constitutional. The company shopped around for a "safe" union. It found the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, which had not bothered to organize Consolidated Edison employees, and signed a contract with it. Then began a campaign, not by the IBEW but by the company, to force employees into the IBEW so as to "legalize" its contract and freeze out the CIO.

The NLRB held hearings on the CIO's charges against the company. It found Consolidated Edison guilty, ordered the reinstatement of six union leaders and the cessation of unfair practices. But Board orders are not self-enforcing and it was not until December, 1938, that the Supreme Court of the United States directed enforcement of these orders.

Meanwhile the company was not wasting time. Under the cloak of this litigation, it discharged 250 active union men and solidified the IBEW's position, requiring thousands of employees to join, pay dues and sign check-off agreements. When the Board's order was affirmed by the Supreme Court, an injunction against future violations was issued—but the damage was done. Consolidated Edison reinstated six men and fired hundreds of others, paid a mere $22,000 in back wages and escaped the cost of unionization. The CIO, after spending two years in the courts to enforce its rights under the Wagner Act, must now institute new litigation because of the company's unfair labor practices during these two years. The company lost the case, but successfully violated the law.

Two years ago, Republic Steel provoked strikes in its plants by firing active union men, using labor spies and refusing to bargain with the SWOC, which represented its employees. Ten of its strikers were murdered and the others were locked out. On Memorial Day the SWOC placed wreaths on the graves of its dead, but the discharged employees have not been reinstated, the lock-out is still operative and the company has not negotiated with the SWOC.

Unlimited wealth and expert legal talent permitted the company to prolong the Board's proceedings, making every legal maneuver, overlooking no sophisticated technicality. When the Board, in April, 1938, directed the company to cease illegal activities, it petitioned for court review. After the Supreme Court decided the Morgan case, the Board, believing that due process allowed the company to argue against a proposed decision before rendition, sought to vacate its order to give Republic Steel this opportunity. The company did not want the fair hearing it vociferously demanded, but victory on a technicality. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals in Philadelphia—then the most reactionary court in the country—supported Republic by denying the Board's right to reopen proceedings. An appeal to the United States Supreme Court was required to persuade the court to release the case. In October, 1938, the Board issued a new decision. The company has failed to obey it. The matter is again before the Circuit Court; another year may pass before final disposition.

Under a proper assumption that the Board's order will be upheld, the company will pay several million dollars to the discharged and locked-out men. It will be enjoined from future espionage and other unfair labor practices and directed to deal with the SWOC. But it is no wonder that employers are willing to risk

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a large sum in back pay for the chance to break a union. The back pay is merely another carrying charge of the business which will be passed on to the consumer—or to the "widow and orphan" stockholders.

Henry Ford is the third largest automobile manufacturer in the United States, but second to none in his hatred of labor. Both General Motors and Chrysler have found it possible to deal with the United Automobile Workers—but not Ford. For he has made the discovery that "financiers are behind the unions and their object is to kill competition so as to reduce the income of workers and eventually bring on war." He said to his employees that "if you go into a union they have GOT YOU—but what have YOU got?"

To combat these "financiers" Ford hired professional pugs and criminals to assault men and girls peacefully distributing leaflets near his Dearborn plant. He fired twenty-nine men because they joined the UAW. He created the Ford Brotherhood, a company union, whose constitution disavowed the closed shop and provided for ten days' notice before a strike could be called.

These violations of the Wagner Act occurred in early 1937. The Board held a hearing the following July and rendered its decision in December, 1937, directing the reinstatement of the discharged men, the disestablishment of the company union and the cessation of other anti-labor activities.

But today, two years after the occurrence of these acts, reparation has not yet been made. The Ford plants are still armed camps against unionism; the Wagner Act is being continuously violated by Ford pending the enforcement proceedings in the Court.

Douglas Aircraft Company is our largest manufacturer of military and commercial aircraft. It is the employer of six thousand men; in 1937 its sales aggregated more than seven million dollars.

Its anti-labor policies are at least spectacular. Three years ago, while an NLRB hearing was pending, on charges by the UAW, Donald Douglas advised his employees on "The Much Discussed Wagner Act." He suggested that if the Board were to disestablish his company union, his employees might reorganize it, accomplishing "technical" compliance with the act.

After a strike in February, 1937, Douglas surprised everyone by agreeing to reinstate all but thirty-eight of the strikers and to arbitrate the cases of those thirty-eight. But as the Board's decision shows, in actuality he refused to arbitrate the cases of the thirty-eight, and refused to reinstate five others. He delayed the reinstatement of eleven, reinstated three and then discharged them, reinstated two others and demoted them. He still has his company union; he still refuses to deal with the UAW. The Board has issued its order, but the courts have not yet enforced it.

Metropolitan Life Insurance Company has a capital investment of $5,000,000,000, making it the largest financial institution in the world. It is a mutual company, owned by its 28,000,000 policy holders. Metropolitan's labor policies, however, are not determined by its rightful owners, thousands of whom are trade unionists, but by a self-perpetuating board of directors.

The agents of this company work under speed-up conditions which would interest the accomplished Mr. Ford. Under the assorted guises of popularity contests among agents, birthday presents for managers and friendly inter-office competition, continuous sales drives are launched, which often force "professional men" to work far into the night for weeks in succession. Public ridicule is the whip for the sluggard (one forty-year-old worker was made to sit in a corner wearing a dunce cap). Wives visited by managers are threatened with their husbands' dismissals unless they incite them to even greater sales feats. It was no wonder that the Industrial Insurance Agents' Union, CIO, organized the company's New York City agents in less than a year. In April, 1938, the union, having won an election, requested the company to bargain with it.

But President Leroy Lincoln continued the kindergarten suasion so successful in driving his agents to increasing expressions of loyalty. He sent every agent a copy of his speech, explaining that unions were not meant for insurance agents, because agents were not employees, but partners in a joint enterprise for the public good. Metropolitan impressed them with the responsibilities of partnership by discharging fifty of the most active agents, some of whom had given the company over twenty years of service.

The New York State Labor Relations Board found the company guilty of unfair labor practices in refusing to negotiate with the insurance agents' union. Metropolitan went to the courts with the plea that the State Labor Relations Act was sovietizing America. Its provisions, said frightened Samuel Seabury, counsel to the company, "contain the essential principles of that species of communism upon which the present Russian dictatorship is founded."

But three courts were unmoved by this danger, and in April, 1939, the insurance company was forced to meet with the union. It listened politely to the union proposals, made no counter-proposals and adjourned to consider the matter. At the next meeting, it declined to continue negotiations, claiming that under the SLRB rules, certification of a union is in effect only one year. The year had elapsed because the company had taken it up in litigation. That, it said, was its legal right. And it wouldn't deal with the union until *another* election.

The company has increased its attacks against the self-organization of its employees. The labor board has begun its trial on these charges, but months will elapse before the discharged men are reinstated and the company is enjoined from future violations. There is no reason to believe that during these months it will not continue its unlawful intimidation of employees.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

These case histories show that wealthy employers have discovered in the Wagner Act a mechanism for its defeat. At the end of its legal maneuvers, Republic Steel will undoubtedly be required to reinstate its locked out men with back pay. It will have to deal with the SWOC, just as Ford, Consolidated Edison and Metropolitan Life will recognize the unions of their employees. But what of the many years before these days of judgment? Does this judgment include compensation for starving families, defeated labor unions and jobless men?

This license to disobey the law is in part the result of the long hearings before the Board. The process of determining whether a discharge was the result of union activities has become an involved one under the careful probing of the Board. In addition, the Board has been understaffed through an unfriendly Congress and months often elapse between the occurrence of an unfair labor practice and the issuance of a complaint. However, the basic reason for the act's inadequacy lies in its own terms: it offers no inducement to obedience; the violator is merely told not to repeat his offense. Robberies would be widespread if their perpetrators could escape with restoration of the stolen goods and a caution not to steal again.

A number of sanctions which would give force to the act merit consideration. The sanctional value of publicity was demonstrated during the NRA, when governmental power and the nation's panic made the absence of the Blue Eagle a mandate to boycott. Today a press mindful of Mr. Ford's advertising as well as of the American Newpaper Guild presents a less impartial vehicle for publicity. Even the notoriety given the Memorial Day Massacre has not restrained Mr. Girdler. In any event the consumers' movement is too weak in this country to be relied upon by labor.

The licensing method, employed by the Securities and Exchange Commission, which permits the sale of securities only upon conformance to its regulations, would be salutary. It may be found that licensing is the only adequate method for regulating the labor relations of industry. But it is a drastic step and at present so controversial that milder sanctions should first be examined.

There are, however, several methods that should be introduced in amendment of the National Labor Relations Act. The first is that of *treble damages* for discharged workers. Unions are not unacquainted with this sanction, since it has been used against them under the Sherman anti-trust law, where its appropriateness was always questionable. It is certainly appropriate under the National Labor Relations Act, since discharged employees cannot be recompensed by the mere restoration of back pay.

Protection, rather than restitution, must be found for those employees who were not discharged but whose unions have been hampered and even crushed. For these people and their unions are victims of the act's violations even while their cases are in the courts. The Board must attain for its cease-and-desist orders the speed with which employers obtain injunctive relief. These orders should become effective upon their issuance by the Board, just as orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission become the law prior to court review. There is even greater reason for incorporating this provision in the Wagner Act, since rate losses which result from court delay are recoverable, while injuries to workers and their unions are not. If this were the law today, Board orders would be more readily obeyed because of the danger of contempt proceedings. Collective bargaining could not be delayed until the union had disintegrated. And the Board's judicial history justifies this amendment, since the majority of its orders have been upheld in the courts.

Another needed sanction is the utilization of governmental power to withhold economic privileges which it controls. The government can refuse to loan money through the RFC. It can refuse to insure mortgages through the FHA. And, most important, it can withhold its purchasing power.

This principle is already written into our law. The Walsh-Healey Act provides that government contracts for business of over $10,000 must contain the contractor's agreement to pay the prevailing wages in the industry and conform to other fair labor standards. The National Labor Relations Act should forbid government contracts to employers who have been adjudged guilty of violating that act. This would change the conduct of so rabid an anti-unionist as Douglas, the major part of whose business consists in the sale of airplanes to the army and navy.

This proposal is still subject to the objection that it results in nothing more than a financial loss to the anti-union employer. Many employers can do without any government business. Consolidated Edison is even more unconcerned and would cheerfully pass any financial loss on to the consumer. In any event it is the stockholders and bondholders without control over their companies who will suffer. But Girdler and Carlisle, who determine labor policies, will be unaffected personally by any penalty placed upon their corporations. And as long as they are unaffected, these illegal policies will continue. Liability must be placed on them, where it belongs.

To prevent this systematic destruction of labor's rights, officers should be made liable to their corporations for damages arising from anti-labor activities. A Girdler who must write his personal rather than his corporation's check will have a real interest in obeying the law. Further, both corporations and their officers must be punished as criminals for violation of the act. The Wagner Act, which has so often been described as stringent, must become so.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There is ample precedent for this change. A violation of the Sherman anti-trust law is punishable as a misdemeanor by a fine of $5,000 and one year's imprisonment. In 1936 Congress, by passing the Byrnes Bill, made it a crime to transport strikebreakers across state lines. The Oppressive Labor Practices Act, sponsored by Senator La Follette, proposes to make criminal the utilization of labor spies and industrial munitions. The Railway Labor Act declares it to be a misdemeanor for a railroad or its officers to interfere with the union activities of its employees, or create a company union. That may account for the respect which the railroads have for the rights of their employees. It certainly indicates that such provisions must be incorporated into the National Labor Relations Act. Otherwise cash, here as in other fields of law, will excuse its violation.

LEONARD BOUDIN

Mexico's 1940

Mexico is a democracy. But in estimating the possibilities of a worthy successor to President Cárdenas it must be borne in mind that democracy is not yet firmly established in Mexico. As yet there are still no great political parties, normal features of a parliamentary democracy, by means of which the electorate may be educated, and administration sustained or checked. The absence of parties has given dangerous importance to personalities and to intrigue; it has made difficult the checking of sabotage within administration circles and has caused what is called "public opinion" to be vacillating and impersistent.

To be concrete, a counter-revolutionary agricultural expert in the government's employ may hang on long enough to his job to frustrate the efforts of a thousand peasants, because sound political discipline is not uniform throughout the service. Or a reactionary colonel may still permit Cristeros and White Guards to harass a dozen counties. And, more importantly, in the case of agrarian reform, no serious criticism of it has been made by the Left since 1917. The Left, of course, has been far too busy defending that very necessary reform against the attacks of the Right. But Mexican revolutionaries have never provided themselves with political theory or an organized machine within which absolutely necessary amendments of the Land Reform might have been evolved. The resulting stagnation in thought about the Land Reform has been so serious that not all President Cárdenas' sincerity, energy and human understanding, with the willing coöperation of the peasantry, have been sufficient to bring complete success.

That the present epoch in Mexico is one of party formation is of fundamental importance for an understanding of the presidential succession. There have been parties in Mexico and they have played important roles. But the only relic of them left at the beginning of Cárdenas' term of office was the PNR, the National Revolutionary Party. This was merely the Calles political machine under another name, designed only for bossing the country and obtaining the return of servile Presidents. Its only useful service to Mexico was that, after a succession of Callista puppets, the machine mistakenly selected another candidate to do the will of Calles. It picked the one man it should have avoided, Lázaro Cárdenas. After the election the old PNR bosses found to their dismay that the man was not a demagogue and meant to keep all his promises about giving effect to the 1917 Agrarian Reform (which was part of the Constitution).

But the PNR remained a mere clique of bureaucrats and politicians and could never serve the purposes of a democratic and constitutional revolution. Accordingly, in the early part of 1938 President Cárdenas was one of the prime movers in the formation of the PRM, the Party of the Mexican Revolution. That party is composed of the CTM, the Mexican Workers' Federation; the CNC, the National Confederation of Peasants; Army Delegations and liberal societies. It is rapidly gaining members but is still far from being a true mass party. On the side of the Mexican Revolution the only other party is the Communist Party, which is small (perhaps 30,000 members), but loyal to Cárdenas. It has an increasing importance, particularly because of its work in the villages, within the framework of the Agrarian Reform.

Calling themselves parties are the reactionary Democratic Front, and the Revolutionary Anti-Communist Party. The latter, a fascist party, is a campaign mushroom. Both, at present, are mere political cliques, but in a country where cliques can be dangerous. The Nazi Party also exists, but its disclosed connection with the German Consulate will be no help to it. Besides these, there are a number of organizations, such as the legally dissolved Gold Shirts, which engage in subversive activity.

The problems of the elections can be stated thus. Will the PRM hold together and put forward one candidate only? Will a single reactionary party emerge from the welter of jostling cliques; that is, will the reactionary groups unite around one candidate? Has Cárdenas really reawakened a mass devotion to the revolution? Will the reactionaries be content to accept an electoral decision if it goes against them, or will they revolt before the elections? If they do, what chances have they?

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is necessary to observe the attitude of the various classes towards the work of the Cárdenas government. The most conspicuous features of this work have been the Agrarian Reform and the oil expropriation. The President's sympathetic bearing towards the trade unions, and his help to Republican Spain also are important.

The attitude of the Mexican peasantry towards the land reform is one, I believe, of modified gratitude. The reform is not so good as their instinctive understanding demands, but they would violently defend it as the second-best thing. If they were forced to defend the reform with arms, their demands would stiffen. There can be no doubt about Cárdenas' popularity with the organized peasantry. I have read through file after file of peasant letters and that much is certain. The organized peasantry will vote heavily for their Federation candidate, who will be, and is, a Cárdenista. Possibly 2,000,000 peasants are enrolled in the CNC; about 50,000 more are in the CTM. But are the rest of the peasants in the same mood?

The land reform has not been a complete success as yet. According to the lawyer who drafted it, Luis Cabrera, a leader of the "revolution of then," as against the "revolution of now," the land reform was never intended as a basis for the whole agricultural economy of the country. It was to be, Cabrera says, no more than a kind of allotments act, designed merely to relieve the peon's poverty by giving him a plot of land with which to supplement his miserable wages. Señor Cabrera's remarks are nowadays always characterized by a brilliant disingenuousness, but there is some truth in his view of the land reform. Zapata and the molders of the plan of Ayala meant what they said, that the land should belong to those who worked it, but many of those who made offers to the peasantry did so merely in order to recruit them into their armies. Others undoubtedly thought the reform would be a means of relieving the peasants that would not fall too heavily upon the landowners. A few hundred hectares pared from an estate of a hundred thousand might enable the low wages to be paid in perpetuity. In other words, the talk of revolution was largely demagogy with these people, as Luis Cabrera himself has made clear. In opposition to this view, Cárdenas is attempting to make the land *ejido* the basis of the country's agricultural production, as the peasantry had believed it was to be.

The land reform, however, still keeps its original character; subsequent amendments have not greatly modified it. Thus, since small-scale agriculture practised upon only moderately fertile, or infertile lands, is never very successful, the material condition of the peasantry has not been raised so much as was hoped. Collective effort, or rather coöperative effort, is a condition of receiving credit from the Ejido Bank. This is a corrective to the parcelization of land, but the money at the government's disposal is hopelessly inadequate. It must be remembered that the total state income of Mexico is about 120,000,000 American dollars, less, I believe, than New York City spends upon education, and that the Cárdenas government has huge commitments elsewhere. (One-fifth of its income is spent on education.)

But the mass of the peasantry, despite some confusion here and there, are firm in their adherence to the reform. At least 8,000 collective demands for land await the President's attention. One has only to read through a few files of peasant letters to ascertain the truth. The unorganized Mexican peasantry will also vote, provided the candidate comes out vigorously for the reform. In the case of the city proletariat, organized for the greater part in the CTM, there is undoubted approval of Cárdenas and his policies. However, it is very easy to exaggerate the strength and unity of the CTM.

I do not think the economic crisis has had the slightest effect on the popularity of Cárdenas among the working classes. It is true that the gains in wage levels have been annulled by the rise in prices. But that this should cause any working class to demand an uncontrolled capitalism is not to be expected. At the same time it must be remembered that the task of welding a number of more or less independent unions, of varying texture and political development, into a solid and disciplined mass is never easy. The difficulties between the Spanish CNT and UGT showed that, and one could come nearer to the United States for proof. The CTM makes steady headway, but it is not heresy to doubt whether its political development is commensurate with its numbers. Nevertheless, upon all critical occasions the constituent parts of the CTM have spontaneously and impressively rallied to Cárdenas. There is some danger of the CTM splitting, but so far Lombardo Toledano's skill and energy have prevented this. The mass of the CTM voters will support the continuation of the present policies.

Many competent judges dispute my opinion that the middle classes, apart from intellectual groups, have largely turned away from Cárdenas. Almost every tradesman and small property owner with whom I was able to talk expressed doubt or disapproval of the present regime. The University of Mexico is a hotbed of counter-revolutionary agitation. For example, Dr. Baz, the rector, has carried on a persistent, skillful and unscrupulous campaign against the formation of a school for rural doctors, which every liberal student of rural conditions feels to be an essential of the revolution. The rector's arguments have always proceeded from a narrow professional viewpoint, but his obstruction of the government's policy has been applauded by all conservatives. The Chamber of Commerce is strongly "anti-Cárdenas." The wave of strikes, some of which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have been unwise, is partly responsible for this withdrawal of the middle class. Mexican law, at present, is sympathetic to striking trade-unionists, since after a strike has been declared justified by the labor courts, "scabbing" becomes illegal. The wages of the striking worker must also be paid upon the termination of a strike. All this was necessary, since Mexican labor conditions were intolerable; nevertheless not every middle-class liberal had realized that his views might cost him something in money and comfort. World events have also had their consequences. The defeat of Spain has encouraged enemies of the regime, as has the indecision of the democracies. In the very age when the bourgeois democracies themselves are yielding to fascism and limiting their own democracies, it cannot be expected that the Mexican bourgeois classes will be enthusiastic about continuing the work they began nearly thirty years ago and which, even in times of less difficulty, they had never had the energy or the intelligence to complete.

The wealthier classes are solidly for reaction, and are becoming more and more daring in their talk of rebellion. At the time of the oil expropriation it seemed that even these people were behind Cárdenas, no doubt because they expected to be able to exploit the country's resources themselves, or at least, to make profitable investments in oil. That patriotic mood has passed. The appearance of anti-Semitism in Mexico, traceable in part to the German Consulate, and the readiness of the press (Excelsior, Ultimas Noticias, Universal, etc.) to foster it, are symptoms of the growing sympathy for fascism of these classes. Anti-Semitism, however, is far from being so widespread in Mexico as the American press would have one think. Prompt condemnation by the CTM of minor outrages and effective action by Cárdenas at once disclosed that the expensive anti-Semitic campaign had no popularity and was carried on by a small group of penniless agitators, many of whom had police records.

Thus Mexico tends to divide into Right and Left, though I cannot agree with an article in the Voz de Mexico that no centrist position is possible at the present moment. This seems dangerously to ignore the fact that within the PRM (Party of the Mexican Revolution) itself there are powerful centrist currents.

RALPH BATES

This is the first of two articles on the Mexican political scene. The second will appear in an early issue.—THE EDITORS

Song and Dance Unions

THE ACTORS' UNIONS are in a mess. The crisis in the Associated Actors and Artistes of America, the parent body of all actor unions in the American Federation of Labor, is over a revolt by about 25,000 night-club entertainers who feel their interests have been getting too little attention. The Associated Actors and Artistes (known as "the Four A's) has expelled the night-club-entertainers' union, the American Federation of Actors, which also has jurisdiction over vaudeville, circus and carnival performers. In addition the Four A's has formed a new, competing union, the American Guild of Variety Artists, with Eddie Cantor as its president.

There is the organizational outline: within the AFL is the Associated Actors and Artistes which used to include the AFA. But the AFA revolted, was expelled, and its place was taken by the new Guild of Variety Artists. All the unions, including the rebellious AFA, are legally within the American Federation of Labor. It is no wonder that confusion exists on almost everybody's part. That confusion in itself is important, because the CIO may take advantage of the muddle and enter its wedge into the entertainment field.

The fight between the Four A's and the American Federation of Actors has been taken to the New York State Supreme Court. The AFA has signed contracts with about 150 employers in New York, but the new Guild of Variety Artists claims the contracts are now void because the AFA has lost its international charter. The Guild declares, in addition, that according to the New York "little Wagner act," when 51 percent of the performers in a night club become Guild members any previous contract with the AFA will become null and void.

There is another legal angle: the AFA is suing for an injunction to prevent the Guild from moving in on its territory. The Guild argues that such a writ would be illegal under the state anti-injunction law. The decisions of Justice Edward J. McGoldrick on both counts are still awaited.

The newspapers featured the sensational and glamorous aspects of the brawl that occurred on June 21 when Sophie Tucker, president of the AFA, was howled down at a mass-meeting in the Hotel Edison ballroom. The news accounts had singularly little to say about the unpleasant details behind the meeting: dancers who play six shows a night for seven nights a week and get a $15 salary, chorus girls who have to rehearse two and three weeks for a night-club show *without pay*, "quickie" night-club owners who open cafés on a shoestring and pay off entertainers "in the dark," filthy dressing-room and toilet facilities behind the gaudy façades of Broadway (and the World's Fair, too) and hard-boiled night-club bosses who compel

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

girls to "mix" with customers and engage in sideline prostitution to hold their jobs.

To understand what led up to the Edison ballroom madhouse—which spotlighted the crisis—it's necessary to glance backward.

Actors' Equity, root of modern theatrical unionism, was organized in 1912 as a genteel social club, but toward 1917 began to take an interest in economic problems. Equity, in 1919, won a great strike against the Broadway managers, and was taken into the AFL. Coincident with Equity's admission, the AFL set up a new organization called the Associated Actors and Artistes of America, whose function was to be the organization of the unorganized actors in every phase of the show business.

For nearly fifteen years, however, the Four A's failed to plow the ground assigned it by the AFL. During this period the Four A's was virtually synonymous with Equity.

In 1934 the American Federation of Actors arose as a spontaneous, rank-and-file upsurge of the most exploited class of actors; night-club and variety entertainers. The return of legal booze put the night club on the map and gave the old vaudeville actors a new toehold in the theatrical profession. The NRA gave them hope that through organization they might win decent conditions. It had always been well nigh impossible to organize the traveling variety entertainer, who lacks class consciousness and a sense of tradition in the labor movement. Nevertheless, Ralph Whitehead, a vaudeville song-and-dance man, began building an organization and received a charter from the Four A's, covering night-club, vaudeville, presentation house (*i.e.*, combination movie and stage theatre), circus, carnival and fair entertainers. From the beginning, although it performed many wonders, the American Federation of Actors seems to have been a one-man union. Little effort was expended to educate members and arouse interest in their union. Meetings were poorly attended. Out of a paid-up membership of 6,000, less than 200 voted in the last general election. Closed-shop contracts were signed with clubs that gave union members practically no real concessions.

The younger members, new to the theatrical business, children of the depression, more militant and labor conscious, became restless. They began to cry for a fighting union, for solid contracts. The malcontents formed a faction inside the American Federation of Actors called the Ferrets—*i.e.*, seekers of rats. They spread rumors in Broadway and Hollywood that the leadership of the American Federation of Actors was corrupt and undemocratic. Several months ago Whitehead officially took notice of the rumors and demanded an investigation of his union by the Four A's.

Instead of clearing his administration, the investigation presented a report charging that the American Federation of Actors had diverted relief money raised from benefits to pay salaries and other organizational expenses, that the union was conducted undemocratically, that it had failed to organize the night clubs, that it was a one-man dictatorship. An impartial board (Whitehead claims it was packed) was named by the Four A's to hear the charges and consider the American Federation of Actors' rejoinder. The hearing began on July 10 and it was boycotted by Whitehead and the other AFA officers, who immediately lodged charges against the Four A's with the executive council of the American Federation of Labor, meeting in Atlantic City on August 7. Meanwhile the hearing proceeded, but instead of presenting the findings to the AFA membership and taking the issue to a vote, the Four A's summarily expelled the American Federation of Actors and revoked its charter. On July 14 the Four A's set up a new union: the American Guild of Variety Artists. All members of the American Federation of Radio Artists and the Screen Actors' Guild who belonged to the American Federation of Actors were ordered to resign from that group and join the American Guild of Variety Artists.

Whitehead admits that conditions behind the marquee lights of Broadway are far from perfect. He contends they were worse till the American Federation of Actors came along. He points out that the Federation raised the pay of members working in New York clubs over a quarter of a million dollars last year.

The plot thickened on July 22, when Whitehead applied to the rival International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees for an affiliation charter. But William Green, it is reported, would prefer to keep the American Federation of Actors intact. Probably the executive council of the AFL will recommend that the Four A's receive Whitehead and Company back into its paternal bosom. If this happens, or if the IATSE is permitted to absorb the American Federation of Actors, the Four A's unions may very well go CIO.

Whatever the outcome, it is certain that a healthy condition cannot exist in the actors' unions until actors themselves take an active interest in their organization. From this point of view the hope lies with the younger performers, such as those from the Aquacade who testified at the Four A's hearings. Although many of them respect Whitehead for his pioneering work, they feel that their best hope lies with the new union, the American Guild of Variety Artists. They feel the Guild offers them more democracy, a militant program and closer ties with other actor unions. They are anxious to fight for decent conditions for themselves and the 25,000 in their field.

MAURICE ZOLOTOW

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Jewish National Army

Sofia, Bulgaria, July 25. – Two Danubian steamers have arrived at Ruscuk with 982 Jewish refugees of German, Austrian and Polish origin intending to go to the Holy Land. . . . Apparently the passengers do not have permits for landing in Palestine.

ALMOST EVERY WEEK for the past year such newspaper dispatches have been cabled from Central Europe. Read singly, they imply only the determination of a few hundred persecuted Jews to reach their Promised Land, permits or not. But read continuously over a year, they add up to another story —the story of 15,000 such permitless Jews who have been brought illegally into Palestine since April, 1938. That mass smuggling of Jews was going on has been known for some time. Three weeks ago Britain was forced to admit publicly that so many Jews were coming into Palestine without permits that, in order to maintain the desired British ratio of two Arabs to every Jew, as set out in the MacDonald White Paper of May, 1939, she would have to suspend all legal immigration for the time being. What His Majesty's Government did not admit, however, was that Britain is almost powerless to halt this running of refugees, because it is directed by a far-flung, underground Jewish organization which has the quiet, but none the less official, coöperation of the governments of Germany, Poland, Hungary and Rumania.

Ever since the middle 1920's, when Britain imposed strict regulations on the number of Jews admitted, it has been an open secret that hundreds have managed to enter the country illegally each year. Most of them swam ashore from outlying vessels or were landed at remote coves along the coast by motorboats and fishing smacks. Others came in at the land frontiers, sealed in crates of merchandise, disguised as Arabs, or guided between the British frontier posts by mercenary Bedouin bands. But by the end of 1937, when it became apparent to the Jews that Britain, despite her Balfour promise of 1917 to make Palestine a Jewish national homeland, had no intention of opening the Holy Land to the thousands of their co-religionists who were being hounded from Germany and, to a lesser degree, from Poland, Rumania and Hungary, new methods of mass smuggling were devised.

Today Jews are being landed on the Palestine coast, hundreds at a time, from regular ocean-going steamers, some of which are actually operated by a Jewish "navy." Others are carried on Greek and Rumanian tramps, especially engaged for refugee-running. With the full knowledge of the governments concerned, the Jews are organized in groups of 300 to 700 in Germany, Poland, what was formerly Czecho-Slovakia, Rumania and Hungary, then put aboard trains or Danubian steamers which carry them to designated embarkation points. If they go by train, they are usually sent overland to Athens, where they board small steamers for the crossing to Palestine. Most of the groups, however, use the Danube and embark for the Holy Land from such Black Sea ports as Constantza and Sulina in Rumania, or Varna in Bulgaria. Hotels along the routes have been set up as way stops where the refugees are lodged, and local Jewish groups act as welfare agencies to distribute food and supplies.

Many refugee boats are compelled to cruise off the Palestine coast for weeks before a safe landing can be made. Severe storms, lack of medical facilities and shortage of food have brought death to hundreds. Most of the landings are made at night, when signals flashed from shore indicate an opportunity, but with British patrol boats plying the coast continuously, the danger of discovery and the loss of a few lives before an escape can be made is always great. Despite these hardships, there are at least 5,000 Jews cruising the eastern end of the Mediterranean at all times, waiting for a chance to land.

Refugee-running on such a scale requires a widespread organization. The directing force behind it since April, 1938, has been an underground Jewish army, the Irgun Zevai Leumi, or National Military Organization. Early in 1938, when it was convinced that Britain intended to throttle Jewish immigration to Palestine, the IZL sent its members to Europe to open a chain of immigration offices. These are now functioning in Vienna, Prague, Bratislava, Warsaw, Brussels, Bucharest and Paris. The German, Polish, Rumanian and Hungarian governments, who jumped at the chance to get rid of their Jews at the expense of Britain, began to coöperate with the IZL, providing immigration papers and approving arrangements for the shipment of refugees. The Nazi government has coöperated so wholeheartedly that, by an almost unprecedented arrangement, the rigid German exchange laws have been set aside so that the IZL offices in Germany can bring huge sums of German and foreign currency in and out of the country to pay for the transport of refugees. With the knowledge of the Nazis in Germany and Danzig, the IZL has already smuggled into Palestine 1,500 of the 5,000 Jews ordered out of the Free City, and intends to do the same for the rest.

The method of smuggling is very simple. As soon as a group of refugees is assembled at the European starting point, the IZL officials collect all passports and immigration cards—and promptly destroy them. This makes the refugees people without a country, but their stateless status is no drawback while on land, for

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each country on the "underground railway" to Palestine willingly passes them along. Once at sea, the lack of papers proves a form of protection. If a boatload of these Jews are picked up off the Palestine coast by the British patrols, they cannot be sent back to Europe because the British cannot prove where they came from. Some of those unlucky enough to be caught have been interned in Palestine prisons, but for the most part these stateless citizens are allowed to go free, and they usually manage to land in Palestine a few nights later.

After more than a year of this mass smuggling, the IZL has the business on a highly organized basis. Five or six vessels, flying the blue-and-white Mogen David (Shield of David), are in regular refugee-running service, in addition to the chartered tramps and Danubian steamers. Many of the Jewish vessels are manned by Jewish sailors trained at the marine schools for young Jews at Civitavecchia, Italy, or at Haifa.

The average charge for each refugee taken into Palestine is $125. For this, the refugee receives rail and boat passage, food, a guarantee of eventual landing in the Holy Land, and food and shelter in a Jewish labor camp for two weeks after arrival. Many refugees are unable to raise even this small sum, but the IZL, through a fund-gathering organization in Europe and the United States, provides for those unable to pay.

Since the IZL justifies the immigration of non-quota Jews on the ground that it is the God-given right of Jews to return to their homeland, it objects to the term "smuggling," preferring to use the words Aliya Beth, or extra-legal immigration. It intends to continue its work for the illegal entrance of Jews until Britain agrees to create a Jewish sovereign state in Palestine based on a Jewish majority of population.

Aliya Beth is only one of the IZL activities. As its name implies, it is primarily a military force, and it is the only Jewish organization now carrying on armed defense activities against Arab bands. Based on a framework similar to that of the Irish Republican Army, the IZL was founded in 1931 by Zionist nationalists who were convinced that the creation of a Jewish state in Palestine would never be achieved without the backing of a Jewish military force. For the first few years, the IZL carried little weight in Jewish affairs, since the idea of force to back a Jewish homeland was anathema to Jewry's dominant body, the conservative Jewish Agency. But by 1937 the mounting Arab attacks upon Jews, together with the conviction that Britain had no intention of allowing a Jewish state in the whole of Palestine, convinced more and more Jews that force was their best argument.

Young Jews flocked to the IZL, and it soon became so important that the British declared it illegal and arrested hundreds of members. Like the IRA, the IZL is organized in close-knit units, and no rank-and-file member has any contact with members of other units. Each officer knows only his own superior. More than 5,000 members have been recruited, equipped, and are being drilled secretly in the Palestine hills. Recruiting is not confined to Palestine. Military offices of the IZL have been established underground in Paris, Belgrade, Kovno, Warsaw and London, where men between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, waiting for their chance to be smuggled into Palestine, are enrolled and trained in IZL principles. The IZL headquarters estimates that the army thus has a potential membership of 100,000.

In Palestine, the most effective army work, besides fighting Arab bands, is its propaganda. Its secret Palestine radio station, "Liberated Zion," broadcasts in Hebrew and English twice a day. It also publishes a weekly bulletin in English, cleverly illustrated with quotes from Kipling and other Britishers to justify the Jewish case. The bulletin finds its way into the hands of British soldiers in the Holy Land. Under IZL direction also are a Jewish daily in Warsaw, and three weekly papers, published in Polish, French and English.

The IZL symbol, which sums up its program, is a fist grasping a rifle, imposed upon a map of the Palestine territory given Britain under the League of Nations Mandate of 1923—that is, Cis-Jordan, the thin coastal strip which is known today as Palestine, and Trans-Jordan, the huge desert area lying east of Cis-Jordan, across the River Jordan and the Dead Sea, which is now a British-managed Arab state under the Emir Abdullah.

The IZL program is twofold: the return of Trans-Jordan as a part of Palestine and the creation of a sovereign Jewish state in the combined area. The IZL realizes that such a state can never be achieved unless the Jews gain a numerical superiority within the country and feels that the only way to achieve that superiority in the face of British immigration restrictions is by Aliya Beth. But, in addition to seeking this goal, the IZL is convinced that the Jews must be prepared to back up, with a Jewish army, their demands for a sovereign state. It is the argument of the IZL that, in the event of war, Britain will need a friendly army in Palestine to protect the eastern end of the Mediterranean from hostile Arabs who have been turned against the British by German and Italian propaganda.

The IZL is convinced that, if Britain is confronted with an armed Jewish force ready and determined to defend its right to a homeland, she will agree to the establishment of Palestine as a Jewish state, and the centuries-old problem of the Holy Land will thus be solved. But Britain, with one eye on an Empire lifeline dominated by Arabs from Port Said to the Gulf of Aden, believes that the problem will not be solved by favoring the Jews at the expense of the Arabs. Palestine is still the twice-promised land.

ALLAN A. MICHIE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Seven Poets of a Crisis Year

The new poetry of 1939 reflects the uncertainty at home and the pessimism abroad. There is little experiment and almost no symbolism in it. It is often defiant. But even in its defiance the contrasting image of a better world is delivered more as an ominous warning to those who loiter than as a message of hope. In the group of poems which I edited for The New Republic last year, some of the younger poets were attempting to synthesize what I called the "social" and "symbolist" traditions. In that year of comparative optimism the Loyalists were still fighting, the New Deal was on the offensive, Czecho-Slovakia was a democracy. But what was characteristic in the "Social Symbolists" was not so much their emphasis on a magnificent future as a certain security that showed itself in extravagance of phrase or wealth of abstraction. The present group of poems, with its undertone of sadness or desperation, seems equally characteristic of the mood of 1939. As the urgency of social questions has increased, styles have tended to become more straightforward and even prosaic.

SELDEN RODMAN

The Ghost of the Clerk

I am a clerk. I read the papers,
Toil at the office under ubiquitous heel
Like random cockroach cutting pantry capers
Seeing what he can earn, pick up, or steal
Before the foot descends or kitchen closes.
Within this somewhat limited horizon
There are but few perspectives; I find my nose is
The safest thing around to keep my eyes on.
I eat, I work, I sleep, am always short.
I go to the seashore Sundays for my sport,
Take in a ball game, get behind the wheel,
By easy-payment plan; the evening meal
Finished, the dishes stacked, then I and Alice
Proceed to the selected movie palace,
In whose noncommittal darkness I am tested
By every obstacle but never bested.
I have emerged unscathed from countless wrecks,
Crossed difficult continents with the Princess X,
Escaped the Tatar arrows, submerged in ships,
Raced in flames, emptied machine-gun clips
Besieging gangsters hidden behind doors.
I have been cast away on desolate shores,
Been stripped and brought to the pot by cannibal tribes.
I have exposed the city official who took bribes.
I knew who stole the diamonds, I detected
The invisible murderer, I was elected;
I commanded at naval engagements; I fought duels
With pistols, rapiers, daggers and kitchen stools,
Washed out a plane or two in aerial combat,
Harpooned whales, trapped tigers, found the wombat.
I have been persecuted and accused,
Convicted unjustly, very badly used.
I stood off the hillmen in a border pass.
Toasted the Queen and bravely broke the glass,
Dined at Le Tour d'Argent and at the Ritz,
Took precedence in the company of wits,
Inherited millions, gave away a throne,
Quelled revolutions by my voice alone,
Excelled in Art and Science, and at the fight
Flattened the heavyweight champion with my right.

After, the lights go up. I rise and meet
The relentless question of the ordered street.

ARCHIBALD FLEMING

Unemployed

Under the roofs of houses a sullen force is sleeping,
resting its weight on motionless rocking chairs,
on papers fallen to floor, tables littered with dishes,
hairpins dangling in hair.

And if the clock is the one thing still in motion,
it is because something must go on
in a world gone dead, and people
with their wish for living gone.

Their despair is quiet, the miserable marble
expressing an infinity of pain:
the man sitting there on the sofa brooding
will he ever lift a hand again?

Will the hand reach out for a comforting cigarette,
caress the woman in the cheap gingham dress,
will she put up the coffee, arrange her hair,
give back the touch of love in happiness?

There were a thousand thousand homes that evening
as the moon slid across the sky,
where the clock tick was the only sound
to measure their history by.

But the moon said: It is going to happen,
that room is going to explode and there'll be nothing to lose.
The stars knew that small flames everywhere
were eating themselves to the fuse.

ROBERT FRIEND

Apollo in New York

Since even Sun-gods are unemployed today,
He hopped a Greek freighter westward with stowaways.
On Mott Avenue, He'll push a fruitcart and say,
"Oh, the Bronx and the old country live the same nowadays."

Through their slicked hair and broad new streets, He shone
Sun's x-ray; bared the same tense streamlined bones;
Searched hard, searched long through both for things he had known:
Serenity among olives, passion static in stones.

PETER VIERECK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Swamp

They went into an alley to shoot craps.
The Negroes sang to the dice, laughed, and rocked rhythm.
The Filipino boy was silent, his face masked in silence,
Until in sudden fury he drew a knife. Before he could strike,
The three black bodies were upon him. One, like a lean wild dog,
Strangled him; a second kicked with one foot and then the other;
The third, who had brought the dice, slashed quickly.
The first two, seeing the dead man, ran away. Their quick breaths
And footsteps pounded into the night.

The killer stayed.
After awhile he rose, walking slowly. Down the street two blocks
He dived into another alley; in sudden panic he ran to a garbage can,
Stepped up on it, stretched to grab a brace in a fire escape,
Pulled himself up to a window and entered a building.
The room was a toilet, with dirty writing on the wall. The boy
Locked the door; then hearing footsteps, he flushed the bowl
And waited. The footsteps passed. He sat down on the lid, staring
At the filth on the wall.

He noticed blood on one finger,
Blood from the dead man, and absently put the finger into his mouth
To clean it. He thought of his mother, down in the hot country.
Then the wall became a moving mass of green leaves,
Steaming in the swamp; a wild thing moved hidden in the deep vegetation;
Catfish were in a stream half a mile down the path, and dreams
Like white flower people, moved in toward him, and he began to weep.

RITCHIE LOVEJOY

Gic to Har

It is late at night, cold and damp,
The air is filled with tobacco smoke
My brain is worried and tired
I pick up the encyclopedia
The volume GIC to HAR.
It seems I have read everything in it
So many other nights like this.
I sit staring empty-headed at the article "Grosbeak"
Listening to the long rattle and pound
Of freight cars and switch engines in the distance.
Suddenly I remember
Coming home from swimming
In Ten Mile creek
Over the long moraine in the early summer evening,
My hair wet, smelling of waterweeds and mud.
I remember a sycamore in front of a ruined farmhouse
And instantly and clearly the revelation
Of a song of incredible purity and joy,
My first rose-breasted grosbeak,
Facing the low sun, his body
Suffused with light.
I was motionless and cold in the hot evening
Until he flew away, and I went on knowing
In my twelfth year one of the great things
Of my life had happened.

Thirty factories empty their refuse in the creek.
The farm has given way to an impoverished suburb.
On the parched lawns are starlings, alien and aggressive.
And I am on the other side of the continent
Ten years in an unfriendly city.

KENNETH REXROTH

Triumphal Entry

He comes with conqueror's pace.
Hail, hero of the empty town!
How quiet is the market-place
Since the bombs came down.

The drums roll, and the horns ring out,
And bright flags stain the air;
No children crowd the curb to shout
To see the soldiers there.

Yet empty now the schoolhouse stands,
And empty since the planes went by;
Children in school in other lands
Will mark this victory.

CHARLES NORMAN

Now Exit

Is it time? Night's premonition is upon
us—the air threadbare and skimmed of light
as if a wing had shaded off the sun.

See Egypt there—or is it the imperial Rome?
They seem so much as one (It surely must
be time), wearing the centuries of dust.

See Persia, too, Assyria and Crete—
behold an unnamed host now nearly in the dark—
behold the silent shoulders in retreat!

Of course, so long as the sandaled footprints mark
direction, we discount the distance handicap—
we will overtake them in the final lap.

For we will steam and motor, we will fly,
our last will be a hydrochloric breath;
they never knew so many ways to die—

they never dreamed such swift, efficient death.
Is the compass set? The hourglass, the map?
Let us not tarry longer. Mine the terrain,
fire the fuse, pull down the switch, and spring the trap!

WALTER BENTON

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

Little Stranger: Colonel Donovan

THIS IS A STORY WITHOUT A POINT, except that it shows the state of New Deal nerves. Its chief character is an agreeable young man, Colonel E. J. F. (Eddy) Donovan of Buffalo, New York. He should not be confused with Colonel Wild Bill Donovan, war hero and one-time candidate for New York's governorship. The latter turns toward publicity as naturally as a flower toward the sun. Colonel Eddy Donovan managed to make himself Washington's most opalescent mystery.

An important factor in our tale is Mr. Marquis W. Childs, Washington correspondent and author of "Sweden: The Middle Way." Alone of his colleagues, Mr. Childs undertook to investigate the rumors about Colonel Donovan that drifted through Washington's whispering galleries. A few days ago, in his newspaper, The St. Louis Post-Dispatch, he printed the first story of Colonel Donovan's activities. He said that Colonel Donovan had established informal political headquarters in a Washington hotel, that he was in touch with associates of Mr. Roosevelt, including Mr. Corcoran, and that he himself believed he would have a vital part in electing Mr. Roosevelt for a third term.

Quite independently, this writer is informed that Colonel Donovan's activities were reported to Mr. Farley before his interview with the President at Hyde Park. Mr. Farley considered them a case of flagrant trespass on his game preserves. Whether he questioned Mr. Roosevelt about Colonel Donovan's endeavors, I have no idea. However, despite Mr. Roosevelt's denials, it can be said with certainty that Mr. Farley left for Europe in an unhappy frame of mind.

In 1933, Colonel Donovan married the pretty widow of the late Mr. William F. (Fingy) Connors, wealthy contractor and newspaper owner, a power in up-state New York politics. In the last years of his life, Mr. Connors had large interests in both Florida and Cuba, and maintained a place at Palm Beach. It now develops that reports of Colonel Donovan's activities in Washington reached members of the New Deal circle, although not the press, about six weeks ago. They were to the effect that he was acting as volunteer liaison agent between the New Deal and important business interests. Many such attempts have been made by many men, and a large section of the New Deal group views them with suspicion.

As soon as Mr. Corcoran's name was mentioned, his friends made prompt, explicit explanations to his, and their, administration associates. Mr. Corcoran is a brilliant, immensely hard-working aide to Mr. Roosevelt; it is part of his job to meet and talk with men who come to Washington with important political backing. In accordance with his duty, Mr. Corcoran had a single, lengthy interview with Colonel Donovan. On excellent authority, it can be said that Mr. Corcoran's friends honorably declined to reveal the identity of Colonel Donovan's sponsor. However, a fresh gust of rumors, which still did not leak through to the press, named him as Attorney General Murphy. Then followed what seems, at least to an outsider, a period of sheer silliness. His brother New Dealers did not quite like to ask Mr. Murphy about Colonel Donovan; complicated plans were worked out to obtain the information by stratagem. Well meaning administration members, in a fit of alarm, took it upon themselves to deny that Mr. Murphy had even heard of Colonel Donovan. Finally Mr. Murphy's friends willingly explained that Mr. Murphy knew Colonel Donovan just as he knew thousands of other Democrats, but that he had nothing whatever to do with his coming here. Promptly rumors shifted to another Cabinet officer. Since he has not yet been publicly mentioned, he shall be nameless here. But, incredible as it may seem, New Deal fellows trailed this Cabinet official to Colonel Donovan's hotel suite, and watched the door until he emerged again.

Meanwhile, what appear to be the simple facts of the case at last reached the administration group. The Donovan-Connors estate at Palm Beach is not far from that of Ambassador Kennedy. Chiefly because of Mr. Kennedy, Colonel Donovan took a minor part in the 1932 Roosevelt campaign. Immediately, however, this was inflated to a report that Mr. Kennedy, when he resigns his ambassadorial post—as he is expected to do before the first of next year—will assume Mr. Farley's powers, if not his titles, and be commander-in-chief of next year's campaign. Colonel Donovan is represented as advance man for Mr. Kennedy, who will be his first lieutenant in the campaign.

As was said above, this account of a rumor's psychopathology has no point. It shows the nerves of highly placed New Dealers to be raw and jumpy. But this does not justify criticism. Those who remember the last months of the Hoover, Coolidge, Harding and Wilson administrations will testify that, relatively speaking, the New Deal still swims in a flood of brotherly love. At all times, the pressure of the immense power lodged here in Washington made easy, decent human relationships extremely difficult. The publication of Mr. Childs' dispatch may be expected to have a healthy effect. As these Notes are written, Colonel Donovan still carries his shield of mystery, but has promised that, in a few days, he will make a formal explanation of his purposes. He will say that he is a business man enthralled by Mr. Roosevelt's magnificent social goals, and that, without prompting or support from anyone, has determined to dedicate himself to Mr. Roosevelt's reëlection.

As these Notes are written, Speaker Bankhead has not announced the membership of the special House committee to investigate the National Labor Relations Board. His choice will afford a clear test of his own good faith, and that of the Southern House leadership in general. There will be five committee members, one of whom, by legislative courtesy, will be Representative Smith of Virginia, author of the resolution and a bigoted enemy of labor. The two remaining Democrats will presumably be taken from the House Labor Committee. They will include Mrs. Norton of New Jersey, and will be friendly to the NLRB. The temper of the committee will depend on the two Republicans whom Mr. Bankhead chooses. From among House Republicans with a special knowledge of labor problems, it will be possible for Mr. Bankhead to pick men who are at least fair-minded about the NLRB. A list of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

such men has already been placed before him. Since it has been reported on seemingly good authority that Representative Smith's hope is to conduct a Red-hunt among the NLRB's personnel rather than an investigation of the Board's work, a failure on Mr. Bankhead's part to pick carefully will be unforgivable.

Two weeks ago in these Notes, in attempting to assign reasons for Mr. Roosevelt's appointment of Mr. McNutt as head of the Federal Security Agency, I pointed out that Mr. McNutt's Man Friday, Mr. Wayne Coy, was a former WPA official and in the confidence of Secretary Hopkins. This was true enough, but I now am told that any suggestion that Mr. Hopkins actively supported Mr. McNutt's candidacy for his present post is untrue.

Washington T. R. B.

Because Heywood Broun is in San Francisco at the American Newspaper Guild convention, his column is omitted this week. — THE EDITORS

Other People's Money

The CIO and the Building Trades

JOHN L. LEWIS is going to organize the building trades. And this will doubtless be the signal for a blast of wrath against the CIO by the reactionary groups which have come, quite suddenly, to love the AFL. This is just one man's opinion, but I do not think it is possible to conceive of a service to organized labor and to the community at large which would equal this in value if Lewis can do it.

The AFL has come to represent a sort of patriotic and substantial, middle-class, conservative spirit in the eyes of the employing classes now. This is because the AFL is the chief foe of the CIO and the employing classes would be delighted to see William Green blast John L. Lewis off the lot. But as a matter of fact, the AFL has been a far more costly luxury for business than the CIO. The CIO has been attempting to organize the poorly paid workers in the factory industries. But the AFL has specialized in protecting the high wage scales of the building industry.

No man can say that a building worker earns too much money. But no one can defend the present wage scale and its attendant working conditions in the building industry. Far more, no one can defend the innumerable schemes in the industry in which the AFL has a part in collaboration with material dealers and sub-contractors to "stabilize" the industry. Some of this is dishonest—labor leaders in secret deals with employers. Some of it is honest enough but stupid, because its effect is still further to destroy this great industry.

The whole policy of the building-trades union leaders has been to provide a higher and higher wage scale for a more and more limited number of workers. The whole plan is to close the door to newcomers. It is a mistaken policy all around—gravely unjust to the workers in the industry itself, unjust to the whole economic community, which is the sufferer.

Of course it is impossible to say what Lewis would do about this. But his record of leadership has been of a far more responsible type than that in the AFL building trades. If he can rescue these trades from their outrageous and almost unbelievable jurisdictional problems, their bad leaders, their bad practices, and bring them some understanding of their place in the economic system, it will be a gain for society all around and for labor in particular.

There is of course one fly in the ointment. Perhaps Lewis is just making a strategic movement. Perhaps he is directing his offensive against the very heart of the AFL with the intention of driving Green into a corner. If Lewis could make serious inroads on the building trades, the AFL would indeed be in a hole and Green would have to make terms with Lewis or see his organization wrecked. Maybe, therefore, it is too much to hope that these unions will be rescued from the Green control and that the most we can hope for is a reunion of the forces of labor.

There is a good deal of feeling, even among some Congressmen who do not look at Treasury statements, that the administration has sprung something new in the proposed lending program. But there is nothing new about it.

If the reader cares to check on this, let him turn to the reports of the Treasury. There he may be interested to discover that this government has already, in one way or another, loaned to various American banks, railroads, towns, states, business firms, home owners and farmers more than twelve billion dollars. Or rather, that much is at present outstanding.

These loans were made not by the government directly but by various government corporations. The government has become a large holding company with its own set of subsidiaries, some of which have subsidiaries in turn. And these various government corporations—more than thirty of them—have been shelling money out for a number of years, a few of them before Mr. Roosevelt appeared on the scene, for all sorts of things.

The money for this purpose has been raised chiefly by selling the bonds of these corporations. But all of the bonds are not government-guaranteed. However, some $5,441,000,000 worth of the bonds of these government corporations have been guaranteed by the government and are just as much a part of the government debt as any other bond.

Of course back of these bonds are the assets of the corporations. The question arises—what are these assets worth? No one knows. Take, for instance, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation. It has made loans of $2,900,000,000. It used its bonds to finance itself and these bonds are guaranteed as to principal and interest by the government. The assets back of them are mortgages on homes taken over by the corporation.

What are these mortgages worth? They are certainly not worth $2,900,000,000. They were bad mortgages to begin with. They were all in trouble. They were all in default or near default with accumulated interest and other charges piled on. These properties are getting older; most of the people who owe the money are in economic difficulties. These are mortgages that no concern operating on a business basis could dare handle. There will be plenty of loss on these "investments." I should guess the loss will be at least 33 percent. JOHN T. FLYNN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No Visible Means of Support

I REMEMBER the lusty belt I got from the first "Beau Geste" picture, and how everybody straightway forgot about being the Sea Wolf or Zorro or William S. Hart, and thought nothing better than to get out in the sand with a bottle of absinthe. And so Paramount's 1939 "Beau Geste" is like meeting up with an old schoolmate who has become the town idiot. This isn't because of the framework of the story, which is still good for handsome adventure. It isn't because of rapidly shifting times and attitudes—going back to "Lives of a Bengal Lancer" almost five years afterward, you will find it just as politically incorrect and marvelous as ever. It isn't even because the movies and I have grown up, a little. The weakness here has something to do with the heart's having gone out of a thing—characters being booted around like old tomato cans, every dramatic effect being thrown bodily into your face, and no time or concern being left for such minor things as plausible motives or reason.

It's the same story treatment: the wonderful idea of the silent fort with its dead garrison, the cut-back to the three Geste brothers as kids, the business of the missing jewel and wild horses shall not make them tell; then the three indigestions popping up one by one in the middle of the desert, the horrid sergeant, cafard, battle, death, etcetera. Of course such a piece of whole-cloth romance can be made ridiculous in the telling—and that is precisely what they did for it.

Unless his good films of the past were pure luck or two other guys, I don't know what William Wellman was doing here as director. And though Gary Cooper is the same flagpole of strength and taciturn humor he always is, there is nothing much he can make out of these strange lines and situations. The rest of the cast are near enough the general production level not to stand out one way or the other—except for Albert Dekker, who apparently had a dream that he was Sam Jaffe and is still trying to wake up from it, but violently.

The Alexander Korda film, "Four Feathers," is a piece of thorough absurdity as far as the story is concerned, but worth mention (if not attendance) for some very fine production values. It is about a young English officer whose upper lip wasn't stiff enough when his regiment was called out to Egypt, to send the Fuzzie-Wuzzies away from where they came from. So his three friends and his fiancée each handed him a white feather, Gad sir, a cad sir. So he discovered to himself that his pacifist talk had been mere cowardice. So he went to Egypt and fought the war practically single-handed, gave back the white feathers, and everybody liked him again. And as far as principal motives go, it is done just about like that.

But the boats on the Nile, the camps breaking up and camels getting under way, the riding and fighting in the desert, are fine stuff—the best of their kind, I believe. There are some amazing large actions, but the atmosphere is best served by the way the camera delights in all kinds of details—in fact, some of the studies of native life are so thorough as to suggest that maybe the working crew was only too glad to stay away from the story as long as possible. Sound is used very shrewdly too—especially the incidental sound that builds up reality in a scene; and for once the "natives" don't seem to be all grease paint and the better class of spoken English. There are sudden shots that point up an effect—the vultures, for example, or that wonderful explosion of birds near the water; and there is a good use of the "narrative" camera in the scene of rescue in the desert. All being done in color, this was more difficult than is usually the case; and more the pity that anything so handsome should be thrown away on such naïve hokum.

"Each Dawn I Die" gains somewhat the same effect of serving up the seamy side in milk and mush, but I found it a little easier to sit through—partly because of the prominence in it of James Cagney, George Raft, Stanley Ridges, Maxie Rosenbloom, George Bancroft and half the Warner lot. The people and the violence of their action were given as much scope as the story would allow; but the story is of the kind that you would have to see to disbelieve. Cagney is a by-line newspaper man who burns to clean up the world (hoo-hoo), and is framed by one of Warner's most evil District Attorneys. In jail he teams up with George Raft, which of course means with a very criminal sort of criminal (bang bang). Cagney helps Raft get away, and in consequence submits to a third-degree that breaks him up completely; but in consequence of something the script writers thought up, Raft then sits playing cards in a hide-away and saying "eh-h-h shet ap!" and forgetting his pledge and pal. The writers do some involved thinking all through here, in fact, and the story doesn't start up again until Raft decides that the way to spring his innocent friend is to get back inside himself (yo ho ho) in time to join in the prisoners' uprising (and a bucket of blood), in which he dies nobly.

The action, the treadmill background, the incidental relations of the men, are brought over with the kind of vividness we expect of pictures. But the writing is as fantastic and out of joint as the muddy poetics of its title (one of a feverish cycle, so stand by for "Look Homeward, Angelface" any day). Like "Four Feathers," it is good in the particular. But either of them could be run with their reels in reverse order: you'd be little wiser, and probably less sad.

The really big laugh of this present season is a deadly earnest piece of comedy called "Winter Carnival." It probably would never have seen the darkness of a New York movie at all if it hadn't been made by Walter Wanger, who has promoted an A.B. degree into one of the fanciest shell games even this industry has seen. With the business-man-gambler sense of any producer, he flushes enough money to get a picture ready for distribution; then he calls in a few ex-legmen and says for release, "Boys, I can't help it if I'm a courageous rebel: I went to *college!*" Well it may sound funny but it certainly gets him around, striking awe into the hearts of Hollywood and (subsequently) The New Masses and (finally, but hold tight) the college itself, which asked him to inaugurate a course in motion pictures.

"Winter Carnival," in fact, is Wanger's tribute to Hoof and dear old Dartmouth. It was changed over from a Corey Ford satire to a straight-face story of young love and disappointment during the carnival high-jinks. Maybe it will be required seeing where the ivy twines (though it is released square in the middle of the vacation, possibly through oversight), but I don't know when I've seen so many unaccomplished actors in so many embarrassing complications. Scattered here and there are shots of skiing and skating and campus buildings—all taken on the spot and then put there. The story is a disgrace to freshman compo-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sition and the direction keeps its development on a level with the action in Charley Chase shorts. I suppose there is enough atmosphere to give a twinge to some fond alumni and enough fake-quaint buildings to keep a few unprivileged gazing in wonder at the strange sight of education. The rest of us can either stay away or go and snicker at the joke that was played on so many people the day Walter Wanger got off the train at Hanover. OTIS FERGUSON

The Bandwagon

Araki threw a bombshell, at a recent Cabinet meeting on further restrictions of raw materials, by muttering audibly, "I wonder if the Japanese cultural life will not be gone by the time the China conflict is terminated." The General's morbid view of the future was occasioned by the prodigious rate at which his young son ran through socks made of the materials Japan's spinning industry is using instead of imported cotton. – *From Eliot Janeway's "Trade Currents" in Asia.*

You cannot measure a doctor's social value by what he does for the poor alone. He may exercise a far higher type of social medicine when he raises the morale of a capable, but discouraged, manufacturer, or salvages the body and soul of a millionaire. – *From The Boston Herald.*

On the question of labor he is progressive, intelligent and social, rather than political. He has made the labor unions legally responsible under financial guarantees, and if the unions attempt to inject themselves into politics they are dissolved. – *From an interview with the Rev. James E. Drought on President Eleazar Lopez Contreras of Venezuela, reported in The New York Times.*

Woof!

Youth today is faced with the alternative of being fodder for war or the fabric of a new world order. – *From a speech by H. W. (Bunny) Austin at the World Assembly for Moral Rearmament, reported in The New York Times.*

No Dice-ky

To make the picture acceptable to French audiences, Donlevy is portrayed as a former Russian; otherwise his torturous brutality, depicted prominently, is unsoftened. – *From a review of "Beau Geste" in Variety.*

Slap-Happiness

Only through this beating did I really get an opportunity to know the German people. They fight for their Führer.

How beautiful. How industrious. How serene it is here in Germany compared to other European countries and our country. – *Letter, quoted in a New York World-Telegram news item, from an American named Curts who was beaten up and jailed for repeating a mild anti-Nazi poem in Germany.*

Our readers are invited to contribute to this column and $1 will be paid for each item used. Address The Bandwagon, care of The New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – THE EDITORS

Correspondence

Dead Ripe

SIR: I note that W. Jett Lauck [The New Republic, July 5] rejects socialization forthwith, and I am reminded of a prophecy that the stone which was rejected shall become the head of the corner. He does not reject it on principle, however, but only because he thinks it could not be adopted.

May I remind your readers that as long ago as 1934 Upton Sinclair got nearly a million votes in the conservative state of California for a plan of socialization or production for use sufficient to employ the unemployed? I'll venture to say that the complicated plan projected by Mr. Lauck would not have got more than a small fraction of that number. In other words I think he is entirely mistaken; this country is dead ripe for some measure of socialization. . . .

Milwaukee, Wis. JOHN M. WORK

There Is No Answer

SIR: Jules Jusserand, the late French Ambassador at Washington, quotes in his book, "The School for Ambassadors," a story from Petrarch to illustrate the fatuity of war.

According to this story, a fool in Florence, at the sight of soldiers issuing from the city, wishes to ascertain the reason of their march.

"Don't you know," he is asked, "that war has been declared on Pisa?"

"But," asks the fool, "will not this war be terminated by peace?"

"How can you talk of peace, O fool," chides his interlocutor, "since the war is now beginning?"

"None the less," shouts the fool, "peace must return some day."

"Well, no war is eternal: there will be peace some day, but now it is war," is the retort.

"Since we must needs come to peace," insists the fool, "why not make peace just now, before beginning the war?"

There is no answer. One is reminded of Oxenstern's "Behold, my son, with how little wisdom the world is governed!"

Fresno, Calif. ARSHAG MAHDESIAN

The End

SIR: Down here in Carolina those letters about Mr. Broun, like the letters about the squabbles between committees and parties, sound like corn-meal mush being poured from one pan into another, back and forth, week after week.

Pine Bluff, N. C. CADWALLADER BENEDICT

[Despite the fact that there were sixteen other letters about Broun in the mail this week, Mr. Benedict's is the last we shall print, at least until they stop sounding like corn-meal mush. – THE EDITORS]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From The New Republic Mail Bag

In The New Republic of June 14, 21 and 28 we printed three articles on "America and the Next War." Their contents consisted of replies by contributors to The New Republic to a questionnaire asking them to choose among seven possible foreign policies for this country. Since our series was closed, we have received some additional letters, excerpts from which appear below.

The seven policies are as follows:

1. Neutrality of the kind existing before 1917.
2. Arms embargoes plus "cash and carry."
3. "Cash and carry" covering munitions as well as supplies.
4. The same as No. 3, conditional on a British guarantee of democratic aims.
5. Economic embargoes applied only against aggressors.
6. Military aid for the democracies.
7. A full military alliance with Great Britain.

Policies No. 2, No. 5 and No. 4 are preferred in that order by the latest returns. The rest of the votes favor the remaining policies or combinations of them. Among those supporting policy No. 2 were Stuart Chase, George C. Stoney, Harry W. Laidler, Lawrence A. Fernsworth, Robert A. Evans, Albert Mayer, Henry C. Wolfe, William M. Galbraith, Wirth F. Ferger, Frederic Nelson, Fred R. Miller, Mason Wade, Leon Dorais, Hildegarde Flanner, Alfred Kazin, James Broughton and Alexander Lindey. Some of their statements follow in whole or in part:

I favor policy No. 2. Policy No. 4 is even better theoretically, but nobody fights a war for "democratic aims," and I suspect the "binding assurances" would foot up to something like the Fourteen Points which Mr. Wilson thought he had assured.
STUART CHASE

I vote for No. 2. If I were thirty years older (above the draft age) or perhaps if I had more confidence in Britain's "assurances," No. 4 would be my choice. . . . It will take a great deal more than a royal visit or a few friendly Foreign Office notes to convince us the Britannia of the Indian massacre is about to fight "for democratic aims." GEORGE C. STONEY

. . . Absolute cash-and-carry plan and prohibition of travel and not a farthing of credit—this is the most important of all. It is what carried us into the last war. . . . Beware of Lothianism. Lord Lothian, author of the appeasement policy that led to Munich, has only one mission at Washington—to impose the British viewpoint on America. . . . Beware also of Kennedyism. It is not such representation of America at the Court of St. James as is to be trusted. LAWRENCE A. FERNSWORTH

. . . We can exert the best influence on world affairs by proving that we can make our own democracy work. . . . Our participation in war is certain not to destroy the seeds of fascism in this country, but rather to foster their growth.
HENRY C. WOLFE

. . . I still believe the holy crusades were absurdly wasteful; I think our own garden is in need of more attentive cultivation; and I happen to be of an age immediately eligible for conscription. JAMES BROUGHTON

Those contributors who supported Policy No. 5 include John R. Longo, Paul Birdsall, George McLure, J. Z. Lurie, Steuart Henderson Britt, Jane Porter Richards, John Stevens and Michael Sayers.

Favoring Policy No. 5 . . . the writer does not believe that this will involve a risk of war; but that on the contrary it will be a definite measure for peace. JOHN R. LONGO

. . . There is a good chance that the adoption now of a clear-cut policy of embargoing aggressors might yet prevent war. . . .
PAUL BIRDSALL

. . . Policies 1, 2, 3 and 7 are ruled out as mere degrees of unqualified assistance to the Anglo-French side. . . . Policies 4 and 5 are preferable, but what are "guarantees" worth after Spain and Czecho-Slovakia? Policy 5 remains with the proviso that the actual "aggressor nation" be fairly determined. . . .
GEORGE MCLURE

. . . If I thought that war was inevitable, which seems to be the opinion of those who worded these questions and those who voted for Policy No. 2, I wouldn't waste my time in formulating questionnaires but would get my passage booked to Bali.
J. Z. LURIE

Among those who favored Policy No. 4 were F. O. Matthiessen, Nathan Asch, Edgar Johnson, John Finch, Jonathan Kilbourn, Muriel Cowley, Harry Thornton Moore, Edith L. Weart:

Policy No. 4, with strong emphasis on the phrase "including Russia" and with the realization that it is very easy to be fooled by alleged "binding assurances." F. O. MATTHIESSEN

. . . Sometimes one is really grateful for not having to make the actual decision. Considering the character of British policy, I think this is one of the times. NATHAN ASCH

I check No. 4 with large misgivings . . . the reliability of Mr. Chamberlain offering little superiority to that of Hitler.
EDGAR JOHNSON

. . . When economic pressure is applied, it can't be all one-sided. England seems to need coercion as well as the Fascist powers. JOHN FINCH

A combination of Policies No. 4 and No. 5 was popular with quite a few voters, including Frederick L. Schuman, Samuel Yellen and Charles Edward Smith:

The central problem of American foreign policy is to safeguard American interest by contributing toward the maintenance of a world balance of power against the Fascist coalition. If this is not done by an adroit use of America's vast economic power, it will eventually be done by a maladroit use of American man power in war. . . . FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

. . . The combination of Policies No. 4 and 5, with the United States a member of the anti-Fascist bloc (not merely a member by virtue of an understanding with Great Britain) would certainly be of value. The snout of a pig understands the solidity of a stone wall. . . . CHARLES EDWARD SMITH

The rest of the votes were scattered. Those supporting Policy No. 6 included Duane Decker and Charles Curtis Munz. Edward Mead Earle, Dr. Felix Pinner and Virginius Dabney favored Policy No. 3. Quite a number refused to commit themselves to any one policy, some because their own minds were not made up, others because they disagreed with our formulation of the questionnaire. This group included Warren C. Huddlestone, Ernest O. Hauser, Alfred Baker Lewis, Guenther S. Anders, Marguerite Arnold, Robert M. MacGregor, Joseph H. Friend and Joe Gould.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Review

Death of a Prophet

IF, IN SOME MAGICAL WAY, Plato or Galileo were to reappear on this earth, and to remain silent for six years, the announcement of a book expressing his most recent ideas would justly be an event of surpassing importance. Every newspaper and magazine in the civilized world would be endeavoring to obtain the privilege of reprinting, and columns would be filled with interviews, comments, analyses, discussions, perhaps even refutations. And yet in June, 1939, there appears the first book[1] in six years from the pen of a man whose intrepidity and originality of thought, whose intuitive brilliance, whose fruitful adventures into the unknown have already given him a place in history comparable to that of such notable predecessors as those mentioned. And if there have been no headlines (which is not entirely the case) and as yet no reprinting, no interviews, no front-paging, it must be ascribed in part to the blind spots which always afflict us with respect to a contemporary genius, in part to the modest and retiring nature of this particular genius, and in part to the curious fear and taboos attaching to every revolution in the established conceptions of organized society.

For fifty years Sigmund Freud has devoted himself to the study of human life. But he has directed his attentions not to those aspects of life which were the most obvious, not to the external manifestations but to the internal operations, the machinery of the soul. In the modern concept of the word, Freud discovered psychology. More accurately, he discovered the technique for studying subsurface psychology, and he has used this instrument with indefatigable patience and incredible courage. He made no secret of his method or of his findings, and he built his theories and modified them from time to time, on the basis of what he and his followers learned from clinical experience.

Some twenty years ago, in the ripeness of middle life, he gave still further evidence of his temerity by going beyond his facts in the construction of theories to explain the data which he had accumulated and to anticipate the discovery of new facts and the correction of old prejudices. In a sense, these theories were but the extension of conclusions about human psychology drawn from his empirical observations, conclusions which can no longer be called hypotheses because they have been so amply supported and verified by the observations of many other scientists. Each new pronouncement of this great genius has been met by storms of objection, refutation, ridicule and skepticism. And time after time, following the initial storm, the reaction against his quiet proposals has died down and their authority become established. I would not give the impression that every postulation of Freud's has been substantiated, because this is far from being the case. Freud has altered and revised many of his original propositions and conclusions, some of them several times. Although he still retains his originality of thought and his courage to venture into unknown territories armed only with the knowledge that he has acquired in the investigation of the human mind, he still records his ideas with a diffidence and tenuousness which are in sharp contrast to the arrogant positivism of some of his skeptics.

"Moses and Monotheism" has already been reviewed so frequently that its essential content is probably well known to most readers of this journal. In substance Freud turns his attention to the psychological implications of the religious concepts which dominate the occidental world. He does not explicitly say so, but he is obviously intrigued with the contemporary illustrations of the ancient quip that half the world worships the Jew and the other half hates him. Of course, the bitter truth is that, to a considerable extent, the half which worships the Jew is the same half that hates him. But Freud's book is not primarily a study of anti-Semitism, having only an indirect bearing on that problem, although he does come to the conclusion that "hatred for Judaism is at bottom hatred for Christianity."

Freud's thesis is that there is support in psychology, anthropology, biblical exegesis and history that Moses was born an Egyptian, that he "chose" a group of Semitic captives to be his special wards and, inspired by the ideas of Amenhotep IV, instructed these Semites with regard to monotheistic conceptions and what was later called the Elohim religion; that he likewise taught them the Egyptian custom of circumcision, and that he led them toward Palestine. The theory continues, to the effect that these semi-civilized nomads reacted first positively and then negatively toward the idealistic "Moses religion," fluctuating constantly between it and a return to a polytheistic worship, absorbed Jahve (Jove) elements into their Midianite Elohim concepts, and thus became sufficiently bellicose to kill their idealistic leader and to conquer and displace the Canaanite tribes. Thereafter, Freud assumes, a second and false Moses was set up as their leader. But the blood guilt for the murder of their emancipator continued to obsess them so that their religion became dominated by ceremonials of atonement, sacrifice and purification. In spite of these, or perhaps because of them, the Jews continued to oscillate between monotheism and polytheism, fleeing centrifugally from the Moses concept to the polytheistic faiths and practices of surrounding tribes and then centripetally back again to rigorous monotheism and nationalism. Anyone familiar with the historical books of the Old Testament must recall the monotonous repetitiousness of the good kings and bad kings, of the idolators and the prophets.

Freud agrees with Christian theology that although Jesus was killed, he let himself be killed as a voluntary sacrifice—innocent himself, but representing those who had "sinned." By thus taking upon himself the guilt of the others—the guilt for the "original sin," which was the murder of the primeval father (Moses)—he set free those "sons" who could identify themselves with him. These

[1] Moses and Monotheism, by Sigmund Freud. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 224 pages. $3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

theological principles were worked out and generalized by the brilliant Jewish theologian, Paul of Tarsus, so that Christianity became the successor to Judaism, the latter becoming a "fossil" religion. The Christians, then, were those Jews who could say, "Yes, you and we killed our God, but we have admitted it and atoned for it and are cleansed from the guilt of it, but you (other Jews) will not admit it. You will not allow yourselves to be represented by the sacrifice of Jesus as we have, and so you must go on suffering and feeling guilty." But in elaborating this extension of Judaism, primitive Christianity receded from the austere heights of the Moses religion, Freud says, and became patently polytheistic, absorbing elements from Greek and Roman ideologies.

This is the thesis of "Moses." The questionable validity of the exigetical and historical proof Freud frankly concedes, but its psychological soundness he defends, and he is fully justified in doing so. It might be in order to indicate what is meant by psychological validity in contrast to historical validity. For example, the proposition that Moses had been killed by the children of Israel in the desert has been advanced and believed by others, but many historians will probably continue to declare that the evidence for it is entirely unsubstantial, that it has, therefore, no historical validity. Freud admits this possibility, but maintains correctly that it does have psychological validity. The consequences, the succeeding events, were precisely what one could have predicted had the murder occurred. As a matter of fact, it need not have actually occurred, provided it were generally desired, for in the depths of the human mind the intention or wish to perform an act is, as every psychiatrist and psychoanalyst knows, burdened with a sense of guilt scarcely less intense than that caused by the actual act itself. That the Jews rebelled against Moses, fought his leadership, disobeyed his regulations, "murmured against" him, is abundantly attested in the Bible, and there can be little doubt but that they *wanted* to kill him.

Therefore, Freud does not have to prove that the Jews killed Moses; he needs only to prove that they wanted to, and felt as if they had done so. He points out that the Jews are a people burdened with a tremendous sense of guilt which drives them constantly on the one hand to make atonements and propitiations to God and to their consciences, and on the other hand (a point which Freud does not mention specifically) to indulge in provocative behavior, behavior that is sometimes described as masochistic.

Psychological validity is further to be found in the illustration of the cyclic pattern of disadvantageous behavior, which in an earlier essay Freud described as due to the "repetition compulsion." The Jews did kill Jesus and, so far as we know, Jesus, like Moses, had committed no worse crime than that of having exhorted his people to worship a single, living God and to give decent treatment to one another. It is to Freud's frank admission that the Jews killed Jesus that some Jewish critics of the book object. In the first place, they say, it is not true; it was the Roman soldiers who killed Jesus, not the Jews. In the second place, even if it were true, one should not mention it just now.

Such objections on the part of the Jews are eloquent testimony to the soundness of Freud's main thesis. To evade the issue on a technical basis, to say, "Yes, of course, the Jews wanted to get rid of Jesus and had him tried in a Roman court, but it was not actually they who stuck the cross in the ground," is a kind of legalistic sophistry which only places those who use it in a bad light. It is as if they would say that the Jews wanted to kill Jesus, but sought a way to accomplish it without assuming the responsibility. Freud does not evade the responsibility or the accusation; he interprets it. One such honest scientific effort to get at the truth, as Freud makes in this book, does more to combat anti-Semitic prejudice than do a dozen eulogies of Jewish accomplishment or a hundred denials of Jewish wickedness or a thousand schemes for attempting to suppress (for supposedly strategic reasons) the abilities or opinions of brilliant men who happen to be Jews.

In pursuance of our thesis as to the psychological validity of the theory, it may be pointed out that whether the Jews were unanimous in their condemnation of Jesus (which they were not) or whether Jesus was killed through the machinations of a few leaders who felt imperiled by his doctrines, is not important. The important fact is that the Jewish conscience acts repeatedly in denial of the accusation of murder. This is intertwined with the tendency of the Christians, or I should say some Christians, to unload their own sense of guilt onto the Jews instead of onto Jesus. Who was actually responsible for the death of Jesus is a moral question and one in which psychology is not interested. What is psychologically important is that Christians and Jews react to guilt feelings, and react to them in ways which are superficially different but actually, in the last analysis, the same—by denial, by atonement, by ritualistic sacrifice.

It would be a narrow interpretation to regard "Moses and Monotheism" only as an analytic interpretation of the Jewish people and their peculiar history. The real importance of the theories elaborated in this book depends upon their universality. For what the Jews did and what the Jews do are what all people do. Someone has said that the Jews are like everyone else, only more so, and Freud has taken advantage of this acute observation to show that certain ideals of self-importance and separation inculcated in the early demarcation of this group enable us to study the application of the psychology of the individual to the psychology of a larger group. And just as Freud is able to interpret the history of the Jews in the light of his knowledge of the psychological history of the individual, so in this Jewish group pattern one can see certain world patterns. Yet, it would be carrying the implications too far to say that the American people still punish themselves for their burden of guilt in connection with the despoliation, robbery and murder of the Indians and the enslavement of the Africans, or that the British people must still atone for the rape of India and South Africa, and so on with France and Spain. It would be a false extension of Freud's theory to think in these terms, because the crimes of these countries were not the crimes of the whole people, as in the case of Freud's illustration. Society has emerged from the tribal group to larger and more complicated units, the mass psychology of which we do not fully understand. But toward an ultimate understanding of them this masterful contribution of Freud's to the psychology of one clear-cut group of people, whose detailed history is a part of our intellectual and social heritage, must be regarded as fundamental.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a pity that Freud did not continue the application of his theory of the oscillations of religious interest between monotheism and polytheism, between Elohim and Jahve-Baal, one step farther. His failure to do so stems in part from a curious Viennese provincialism with which he has always been afflicted. For, just as the early church theology and its subsequent Roman development represented another swing away from monotheism into a more or less militant polytheism, so the Protestant Reformation represented a swing back to the monotheistic Elohim religion of Moses. In essence Protestant Christianity, the Moses religion of Elohim and the Ikhnaton worship of Aton are analogous and in a sense continuous. Hence, it is no mere accident of geography that the Protestant Christians of England and the United States should have been the defenders and friends of the persecuted Jews of Germany and Austria, or that the Catholics, on the other hand, in spite of the possibility that they may meet the same fate as the Jews, should have stubbornly defended the fascist regimes of Franco and Mussolini and, indirectly, of Hitler. It is true that most of the Nazis of Austria and Germany are, or were, nominally Protestants, but it is also significant that under the Nazi regime they are being compelled to relinquish this Judaic faith. If one finds no Catholic figure in Europe corresponding to the Protestant Niemoeller, it is not because Catholics are not brave and willing to suffer and die for their faith. It is because Hitler is exactly right when he says that Christianity, meaning Protestant Christianity, is Jewish, that is to say, a monotheistic Moses religion; Catholicism, on the other hand, as Freud says, is polytheistic and in this sense non-Jewish. Freud neglects to make this exceedingly important distinction, but throughout his book refers to Christianity as if it were synonymous with Catholicism.

Similarly, Freud neglects the fact that reformed Judaism is also a return to the spirit of the Elohim religion, with far less emphasis upon rituals of atonement and propitiation and far more upon the improvement of the interpersonal relationships between human beings. It no longer struggles with the temptation to return to the many gods, subtly implied in that clarion cry of orthodox Judaism, *"Schma, Israel, adonoi elohainu, adonoi echad!"* "Hear, O Israel, the Lord is our *Gods* [sic] the Lord is one!" On a psychological basis Protestant Christianity and reformed Judaism should long since have become amalgamated, since both in theory and in practice they represent one great religious ideology as opposed to the utterly different ideology of Catholicism. It is not our function to evaluate these any more than does the author of "Moses and Monotheism," and it may be that the Jahve system can better serve the needs of some human beings than the monotheistic system. There is much to indicate that it better serves the uses of autocracy and tyranny. But there should be no shutting of one's eyes to the facts that this is the real distinction between these world religions, and not the many trivia which are advanced to maintain secular separatism.

This is the great social message of Freud's book. Superstitious religion stems from the neurosis of the individuals that compose society and serves regularly to cloak the actions of hate in a pious disguise. Such religion is based on the theory that men were made by "the gods" in their image. Religious concepts which recognize that man created God, that he is an ideal constructed from unconscious memories of a benign father with the highest aspirations of human thought, that he represents not some shibboleth for the entrance into a future life, but the index of an increased regard for the dignity of present-day human life —this is the spirit of a civilized, intelligent religion. But like the Aton religion, the Moses religion, the Elohim religion, the Jesus religion, it is not one which lends itself to vigorous exploitation. In this sense it suffers the weakness of democracy as compared to the strength of autocracy. Its strength is internal rather than external. The ultimate victory of this kind of religion would be marked by its official disappearance; man will have achieved the social wisdom that would make religious idealism no longer necessary.

KARL MENNINGER

Faith Plus Works

Days Before Lent, by Hamilton Basso. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $2.50.

INTEGRITY is a strange virtue: it won't do to become too self-conscious about it, lest it slip over into unctuous self-regard, or into a cranky, aberrant individualism that denies all sympathy for less "honest" human beings. The prime example of "integrity" in modern literature is, perhaps, Joyce's autobiographical Stephen Dedalus, who, in his pride, ends up by walling himself away from common (*i.e.*, compromising) humanity, a recluse who is saved only by his own genius. Preoccupation with characters of integrity often gives us a literature of prigs and soreheads and self-pitying people who blame their failures on Society, and after reading about such characters we come to realize that there is much to be said, as Lincoln Steffens often argued, for the "honest crook."

The precise point at which personal integrity ceases to be a virtue and passes over into a sterile self-regard has never failed to fascinate Hamilton Basso. His latest novel "Days Before Lent," vibrates with subtle variations on this theme. On one level, "Days Before Lent" is simply a good, dramatic story, a little sluggish in its opening pages, of the interweaving of crises in the lives of five people who happen to be in New Orleans during Mardi Gras week in the early 1930's. There is Dr. Jason Kent, a young bacteriologist who can't make up his mind whether he ought to go to India on a job involving pure research or stay home and get married. There is Father Victor Carducci, a Catholic priest who wants, against the wishes of his superiors, to start a producer coöperative for the New Orleans unemployed. There is Tyrell Surtees, the "lost generation" playwright who can't quite decide to kill himself. There is Joe Piavi, the punch-drunk ex-pug whose will-to-the-limelight is entirely dependent on a courage derived from smoking marihuana. Finally, there is Dr. Arnaldo Gomez, the exiled revolutionist from Paraguama, who balances the security of life in New Orleans against the old desire of his youth to free his countrymen, for the most part primitive Indians, from the horrors of dictatorship. All of these people are tied together in an intricate plot because of their relation with Dr. Kent. But the plot is as unimportant as it is plausible; it springs naturally from the interaction of character, but the ethical dilemmas of the various people who are hag-

LIBRARY
STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE
JOHNSON CITY, TENNESSEE
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ridden by the necessity of choice are what count for Mr. Basso.

These ethical dilemmas—or two of them, at any rate—are orchestrations in other terms of Mr. Basso's own dilemma as a writer who wants to preserve his integrity without coming to worship it. Mr. Basso has seen many novelists come and go; he has watched the procession of artists to Paris, to New York, to the ranks of the Revolution with a capital R. All of them, he notes, were chasing after the will-o'-the-wisp of an impossible purity, rejecting their original environments because of an unwillingness to compromise with bourgeois standards but unable to win through to a New World of their own. For a time, no doubt, Mr. Basso himself sought to preserve his own artistic integrity by a rejection of his native South: he wrote a presumably autobiographical novel in his sunny "Cinnamon Seed," and then struck out for New York. The average New Yorker's tolerance appealed to Mr. Basso. But then he began thinking it over: the tolerance of Manhattan, he came to suspect, derived more from an insulated can't-be-bothered-with-other-people attitude than it did from superior virtue. And the artists, the seekers-after-integrity, seemed to dry up the more they pushed for personal salvation. Rejection of the bourgeois world of their origins separated more and more of them from their natural subject material; and the more they became "saved" as citizens, or as individuals, or as revolutionists, the more they were damned as artists.

Accordingly, Mr. Basso decided there was something wrong with the questions which others of his generation were asking themselves. Giving up on New York, the Revolution, what-not, he went home, back to the South, where he now spends most of his time. His third novel, "Courthouse Square," was a reflection of his pilgrimage; it is the story of a young writer who decides to stay home and buck the prejudices of his community while, at the same time, continuing to write out of the sights and sounds that have always nourished his art. But the problem of "Courthouse Square," was just a trifle specious; after all, the writer-hero did not have to make his living out of his home community. His market being far-away, tolerant New York, he could afford what Stuart Chase has called the "luxury of integrity."

In "Days Before Lent," however, Mr. Basso has caught up with himself. Dr. Jason Kent's choice is between the Integrity (with a capital I) of making himself a devotee of pure research untainted with commercialism or of becoming a simple M.D. on a New Orleans back street. In the end the back street wins: Jason decides that if people won't stay at home and try to leaven society from the bottom up there will never be any improvement worthy of the name. "Days Before Lent" begins as a simple dramatic novel; it ends as a humanist parable. To some people it will seem that Mr. Basso has fallen for the old fallacy that a "change of heart" is all that is necessary for a social revolution. But Mr. Basso has fallen for no such thing. The change-of-heart theory is usually presented as synonymous with the faith-without-works theory. Mr. Basso, a good instrumentalist, most emphatically doesn't believe in faith-without-works. What he does believe in is a faith-plus-the-work-that-an-individual-can-best-do. If a doctor has ability as an agitator, then perhaps he ought to be working for socialized medicine. But if a doctor's ability lies in ministering to the poor for small fees in the community that he knows, then he ought to do that. Mr. Basso is merely arguing for an appropriate division of labor in the field of bringing about necessary social change.

Which brings us back to what, as a writer, lies closest to Mr. Basso's heart. Tyrell Surtees, the playwright who kills himself, became defeatist because he listened to and believed the fashionable cant of the early 1930's that pictured us all as damned if we couldn't become politicalized cogs in a Revolutionary machine. But Mr. Basso thinks such a view is as false as it is lurid. He knows that societies are seldom damned or saved; they merely change. His book is in its essence a preachment against the Salvationist's way of looking at things; an argument against the human animal's propensity for deluding himself by the use of "either-or" words. Logical positivists, who believe that most of mankind's classic dilemmas (such as Free-will versus Predestination) arise from a faulty use of language, will take Mr. Basso's novel to their hearts; others will reject it. But there are few who won't enjoy reading it. For Mr. Basso writes with both wit and eloquence; and "Days Before Lent" is the best novel of a man who has already written a good novel in "Cinnamon Seed" and fair-to-middling ones in "In Their Own Image" and "Courthouse Square."

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN

Argentinidad

Introduction to Argentina, by Alexander Wilbourne Weddell. New York: The Greystone Press. 301 pages, map. $3.

AMBASSADOR WEDDELL is a sixty-three-year-old career diplomat, a tall, florid-faced gentleman of distinguished bearing, fond of good food, good clothes and genuine antiques. After twenty inconspicuous years in various consular posts on four continents, he went to Buenos Aires as Ambassador in 1933. There he soon established himself as President Justo's favorite Sunday-morning golf partner. He was always available for school commencements, dedications, ceremonial occasions large and small.

He traveled from one end of the country to the other, coming to know it better than most native Argentines. The new Argentine President, Roberto Ortiz, testifies to "the widespread feeling that you are the American Ambassador who has been closest to us." To this gift for getting along with the heads of foreign governments, add the constant exercise of tact and discretion and you describe Mr. Weddell's conception of diplomacy. Soon we shall see how it works in Franco's Spain.

Mr. Weddell has not tried to write a profound or significant book about the Argentine Republic. He has simply tried to answer the questions that his fellow citizens have most frequently asked him. He has been mindful of what a visitor might miss and so he succeeds in producing a book that any traveler to Argentina will find useful.

To most of us the Argentine Republic is Buenos Aires plus the pampa, and we have a fairly clear impression of each. But, as Mr. Weddell shows us, it is much more. It is the Andean lakes—a score of Lake Louises—turquoise blue or creamy green between steep forest-clad and snow-capped mountains. It is Iguazu's incomparable cataract, a greater Niagara plunging mist-veiled over a terraced escarpment, in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a virgin tropical jungle. It is the intimate charm of the Cordoba Hills, with their comfortable modern hotels and their sixteenth-century churches. It is the turbid waters of the Paraná, moving sluggishly mile-wide between its low-lying banks for hundreds of miles from the continent's heart to the River Plate estuary. It is the old provincial capitals —Cordoba, Tucuman, Salta, Jujuy, Santa Fé—with their ancient cathedrals and somnolent plazes, their colonial architecture, their memorials of the wars for "Independencia." It is the Argentine Newport, Mar del Plata, with its beaches thronged by day and its casinos crowded at night. With these and the wealth-producing plains and the glitter and bustle of the metropolis, you almost have Argentina.

But not quite. There are the people themselves, proud, sensitive, with their Spanish heritage, looking back to their truly great national heroes and looking forward with confidence in the future. The land and the people together create their national personality, their "Argentinidad." There is reason to believe that Mr. Weddell's book, with all its limitations, will help us to appreciate the meaning of that word and thus furnish a basis for understanding between Argentina and the United States too solid to be materially affected by such trifles as the late loose talk about Argentine corned beef.

B. P. ADAMS

More About the Brontës

Pattern for Genius, by Edith Ellsworth Kinsley. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company. 384 pages. $3.50.

THIS STORY of the Brontës is interesting as reading and also as an experiment in literary biography. Using as a dramatic line the career of Branwell, the brilliant and spoiled brother who gave his sisters some idea of the outer world by drinking himself into the shakes, the author shows the Brontës as nearly as possible in their own words. From novels, letters, earlier copybooks, etc., she is able to sift out a lot of material based on family characters and the scenes of Haworth. This she used exactly as it stands, with elisions, transpositions, but no actual change of text except that of substituting the probable name for the name of fiction. The main body of this material is scrupulously kept in quotes and all sources are keyed in an appendix.

The Brontë family is unique as a field for this kind of exercise. Partly by situation and partly by temperament they were a fiercely inward-growing family; they read and practised literary creation with a passion that started around the age of six, and their works are centered tightly around this familiar life. But the obstacle to making them speak for themselves is the same as elsewhere: fiction, and especially Victorian fiction, moves on a different plane from life, it is more highflown, idealized, twisted to fit a story form. The difference is clear in "Pattern for Genius" when the text shifts from "Branwell" in "Wuthering Heights" to Branwell as reported in letters. And more subtly than that, it is clear in the shift from Charlotte, the rather smug moralist who only saw and believed what she chose to, to Emily. Emily was the one who best understood all of them. But Emily wrote voluminous private papers, some poems and one twisted first novel. She then died, sister Charlotte thoughtfully destroyed the papers, and the door was locked.

The author's own style in the book is appropriate to its

VINCENT SHEEAN

"His new book stands above PERSONAL HISTORY," says the *New York Times Book Review*.... "In the writing there is the strong throb of a spirit which may, if it spreads, check the rise of fascism, as Jim Lardner tried to check it, near Hill 376, at Corbera, in Spain, on the night of Sept. 23, 1938."

JOHN CHAMBERLAIN says, in the *New Republic:* "The finest thing in the book by all odds is the chapter called *The Last Volunteer*, which is the story of Jim Lardner's enlistment in the International Brigade."

And FRANZ HOELLERING writes, in *The Nation:* "The author of *Personal History* returns in his newest book to the genre of his great success—reporting in a literary style that goes beyond newspaper writing, presenting the temperament, the feeling, and thoughts of the observer as he looks at worlds great and small."

120TH THOUSAND

Including Book-of-the-Month Club

NOT PEACE BUT A SWORD

$2.75 DOUBLEDAY, DORAN

FOR QUICK SALE

900 feet above sea level where air and water are both clean and pure. At Mont Vernon, N. H. Best View in Southern New Hampshire. A country estate suitable for—A health Sanitarium, Summer or Winter. A boys' or girls' camp or school. An artists' colony. A trout hatching or rearing plant. A poultry, sheep or cattle ranch. In good Ski country.

It consists of one 8-room house with bath, electricity, two fireplaces, some hardwood floors and some original soft pine floors. One new 4-room cottage with hardwood floors, fireplace, electricity on ¾ acres of land. An unlimited supply of pure spring water, bubbling up through white sand piped into both houses through cement lined pipes. From 60 to 70 acres of land, 40 in soft pine, 30 in cleared fields. Plenty of firewood. A natural blueberry and apple soil with at least 1,000 high-bush blueberry bushes now bearing and 20 apple trees old and new.

One quarter mile frontage on Francestown Turnpike, a State Highway kept open all year around. 20 miles from Peterborough Artists Colony. Tax rate, $28 per thousand with low valuation in a well managed town. Will sell one or both properties if taken quickly. Address:

M. J. TRACEY, Mont Vernon, N. H.

Telephone: Milford, N. H., 514 M. 1

BOOKS

POSTAGE FREE

Books of all publishers promptly mailed anywhere in the U.S.A.

NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 E. 49th St., New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

period, and sometimes goes it one better: " 'Mare' was a word as inconceivably shocking to Miss Brontë's ear as the female appellation for dog." Like any biographer, she has her own explanation where there is a choice among several, or none is forthcoming; she has a good general understanding. The result is not only an experiment but a contribution. OTIS FERGUSON

New Books: A Reader's List

GIBRALTAR AND THE MEDITERRANEAN, by G. T. Garratt (Coward-McCann, $2.50). A history of the famous rock, showing how the once impregnable bastion of British imperial security has been made vulnerable to a tri-dimensional (land, sea and air) attack by the Axis powers and Fascist Spain, thanks, so the author says, to the fatuousness of Britain's Tory ruling class.

NEBRASKA: A Guide to the Cornhusker State, by Members of the Federal Writers' Project (Viking, $2.50). Nebraska from the fossil period to Senator Norris, with plenty of information about the present point in its course—the larger towns, suggested tours, local regional specialties, rodeos, Indian powwows, cornhusking contests. Comprehensive and accurate history, sustaining the Project's reputation for fact and color.

PETTICOAT VAGABOND AMONG THE NOMADS, by Neill James (Scribner's, $2.75). Journey through Lapland by a woman who's not put out by anything except maybe being thought a softie. Good adventures that serve as a painless way of absorbing information about a distant and generally fascinating country.

GANDHI TRIUMPHANT! The Inside Story of the Historic Fast, by Haridas T. Muzumdar (Universal, $1). An account of the "fast unto death" of March 3-7, 1939, by a zealous partisan of the Mahatma, given to wishful thinking about "the United States of India." For all its hysterical tone and babu English, it supplies an important picture of British colonial administration as the sun sets upon the Empire.

SKYLARK, by Samson Raphaelson (Knopf, $2). A first novel by the author of "Accent on Youth." About a successful young executive with two loves—his wife and his office. The plot isn't new but Mr. Raphaelson knows plenty of tricks and twists to keep it on its toes.

Notes About Books and Magazines

Rights to a republication of Georgia O'Keeffe's Portfolio of Paintings, originally issued by Knight Publications in 1937 to sell at $50, have been obtained by The Dial Press. The new edition, to be released on October 20, will appear in slightly smaller format, priced at $15.

Philosophic Abstracts, a new quarterly covering current philosophic literature in the United States and abroad, will make its first appearance on October 15, under the editorship of Dagobert D. Runes. Among the contributing editors are: Irwin Edman, Kenneth Burke, Ernest Nagel, V. J. McGill, Sidney Hook and Richard P. McKeon. Address communications to Philosophic Abstracts, 884 Riverside Drive, New York City.

The extension of the Fellowships of the John Simon Guggenheim Memorial Foundation to four additional countries of the Western Hemisphere—Brazil, Peru, Uruguay and Canada—has now been announced. The Fellowships offered to Canada will also be available to the Crown Colony of Newfoundland, and Puerto Rico is included in the Latin American Fellowship plan.

Planes, a new "little magazine" devoted to "the expression of the contemporary scene through the medium of the short story, articles and poetry," makes its first appearance with the July number. Subscriptions and contributions are to be addressed to Alfred Morang, editor, No. 1 Placita Rafaela, Santa Fé, New Mexico.

Contributors

LEONARD BOUDIN is a practising labor lawyer in New York City.

RALPH BATES is a British novelist whose books include "Lean Men," "The Olive Field" and "Sirocco." He recently spent six months in Mexico.

MAURICE ZOLOTOW is a free-lance writer whose articles on the lighter side of Broadway are regularly syndicated by King Features. He formerly worked on the editorial staff of The Billboard.

ALLAN A. MICHIE was formerly a contributing editor of Time. He has spent the last several months in Washington, working on a book, "Dixie Demagogues." He has written for The New Republic under the pseudonym of Bruce Allen.

ARCHIBALD FLEMING is the author of "The Island Called Pharos" and a play in verse, "The Destroyers." He lives in Pomona, New York.

ROBERT FRIEND lives in Brooklyn, New York. He has contributed poems to Common Sense and The New Masses. He has been on the Federal Writers' Project.

PETER VIERECK, a post-graduate student at Harvard, was awarded the Lloyd McKim Garrison medal for undergraduate verse.

RITCHIE LOVEJOY has written some stories while working in Alaska and down the Pacific Coast, but "The Short Road" (of which "The Swamp" is one section) is his first poem. In 1934 he published with his wife a little hand-set newspaper in Sitka, Alaska, and now manages a department store in Pacific Grove, California.

CHARLES NORMAN resigned from the Associated Press in March to devote himself to writing a biography of Christopher Marlowe. He has had two books of verse published and is now at work on a third, to be called "The Savage Century."

KENNETH REXROTH was born in South Bend, Indiana, and has contributed to experimental magazines and to "The Objectivist Anthology."

WALTER BENTON was born in Austria and passed through Ellis Island in 1922. He is a graduate of Ohio University, works for the Department of Welfare in Staten Island and lives in New York City. Some of his poems have recently appeared in Poetry, Scribner's and Common Sense.

SELDEN RODMAN, who edited this brief anthology, is the author of several books of verse and is co-editor of Common Sense. He recently edited "A New Anthology of Modern Poetry" for the Modern Library.

KARL MENNINGER, the author of "Man Against Himself," is president of the Topeka Psychoanalytic Society.

B. P. ADAMS was for many years on the editorial staff of The Literary Digest. He spent the year 1937 as special assistant to the Argentine Treasury Ministry and has traveled extensively in Argentina.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED